

MICHIGAN STATE

LIBRARY

THE DUBLIN REVIEW

Edited by Wilfrid Ward
& Monsignor Barnes

Volume CLVIII

Quarterly Nos 316, 317; January & April 1916

BURNS & OATES
28 Orchard Street London W

STATE MAGNOM

YRAREU

THE CONTENTS

January and April 1916

| | |
|---|--------|
| Bishop Hedley. By the Editor | Page 1 |
| German Catholics and the War | 13 |
| A Plea for Nationalism. By the Very Rev. Fr Cuthbert, O.S.F.C. | 36 |
| Art after the War. By the Rev. Thomas J. Gerrard | 51 |
| Aristocracy. By Bernard Holland, C.B. | 67 |
| The Use of Aircraft in the Present War. By Eric Stuart Bruce | 84 |
| Catholicism and International Law. By His Honour Judge Sir Geo. Sherston Baker, Bart. | 103 |
| The Gifford Lectures of Mr Balfour. By the Rev. John Rickaby, S.J. | 119 |
| Before the Hierarchy. By Canon Barry, D.D. | 136 |
| The Eastern Churches and the War. By the Rev. Sydney F. Smith, S.J. | 157 |
| Some Recent Books | 182 |

Dream of Gerontius. By Cardinal Newman—The History of England. By John Lingard, D.D., and Hilaire Belloc—Introduction to the Economic History of England. By E. Lipson—Royalist Father and Roundhead Son. By Cecilia, Countess of Denbigh—Journal in France and Letters from Italy. By T. W. Allies—Conduct and the Supernatural. By L. S. Thornton—Belief and Practice. By W. Spens—The Church of Christ. By the Rev. P. Finlay, S.J.—Apotheosis and After Life. By Mrs Arthur Strong—Is Schism Lawful? By Fr Maguire—Confirmation: a Study in the Development of Sacramental Theology. By Fr O'Dwyer—The Personality of Christ. By Abbot Vonier—Birth Time of the World. By Dr Joly—Attila and the Huns. By Edward Hutton—War and Christianity. By Vladimir Soloviev—etc., etc.

The Contents

| | |
|---|----------|
| Spain and the War. By the Bishop of Southwark | Page 209 |
| The Memoria Apostolorum on the Appian Way. By Prof. Rodolfo Lanciani | 220 |
| La Philosophie Scolastique et la Guerre. By Prof. Fernand Deschamps | 230 |
| Anthologia Laureata. By the Rev. C. C. Martindale, S.J. | 259 |
| The Religious Ideal of the Slavophiles. By the Rev. A. Palmieri, O.S.A. | 266 |
| Islam : a Christian Heresy. By Mgr. Barnes | 288 |
| Letters of a Jesuit Father in the Reign of George I. By Richard Cecil Wilton | 307 |
| Infant Mortality and the Population. By Dr Alice Vowe Johnson | 324 |
| A Versatile Bishop of the Fifth Century. By the Rev. Francis St John Thackeray | 336 |
| Clause-Length in English Prose. By the Rev. John Chapman, O.S.B. | 346 |
| Civil Liberty in Peace and War. By the Rev. J. Keating, S.J. | 353 |
| Some Recent Books | 379 |
| The Crowd in Peace and War. By Sir Martin Conway—Dieu; Son Existence et Sa Nature. By Père Garrigou-Lagrange—Commonitorium of Vincentius of Lerins—Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity. By F. Legge—Comparative Religion, its Adjuncts and Allies. By Dr L. H. Jordan—The Romanticism of St Francis By Fr Cuthbert—The English Franciscans under Henry III. By J. Sever—Mediæval Anthology. By Miss M. Segar—St Catharine of Siena. By C. M. Antony—The Story of the Catholic Church. By Fr George-Stebbing—The North-West Amazons. By Captain Whiffen—A Century of Scientific Thought. By Sir Bertram Windle—My Slav Friends. By Rothay Reynolds—etc., etc. | |

BISHOP HEDLEY

THE late Dr Hedley was a man the extent of whose gifts would hardly be suspected by a chance acquaintance. At first meeting he was somewhat blunt and *brusque* in manner. One felt, indeed, the force of his character, but the manner was hardly sympathetic. One would at first sight be inclined to explain his bluntness by ranking him among the men of deeds and not words. His remarkable refinement, the depth of his thought, the width of his learning, and, above all, the wide sweep of his eloquence came upon one whose impression of him was derived from a brief conversation as a great surprise.

This disguise of his greatest gifts arose largely from a deep reality of mind, which made him hate all unnecessary display. He had the true Benedictine sense that character was all in all—that what you do and are matters much; what men think of you matters very little indeed. He was in some respects the true successor of the great prelate who gave him episcopal consecration, Dr Ullathorne of Birmingham. Both had the Benedictine calm and solidity. Both had the note of spiritual wisdom in their writing. Perhaps Dr Hedley was not a man of so much force as the late Bishop of Birmingham, but his culture, and the refinement of his tastes, were in some respects greater. He was, in early years at all events, an accomplished musician, and I recollect his staying with my father in the Isle of Wight in 1872, before he was a Bishop, and our passing long hours singing selections of Mozart's *Nozze di Figaro* to his accompaniment on the pianoforte. He had, I believe, also good judgment, and excellent taste in matters of art, while his sense of literary form was exceedingly delicate.

If the Bishop did not impress the casual acquaintance with any suspicion of the extent of his gifts, it was natural that they were not adequately appreciated by the world at large, although by a not inconsiderable

Bishop Hedley

number of devoted disciples they were realized to the full. I venture to prophesy a steady increase in Dr Hedley's fame.

The world's great men are often not fully appreciated in their lifetime. The absence of advertisement, or want of an appreciative audience, may stand in the way of complete or general recognition. This is especially true of thinkers who are ahead of their age, and whose pregnant utterances are verified in a later generation. But it is also true of genius in other departments. John Sebastian Bach stands now in the very first rank of great musicians; it was not so in his own lifetime. Jane Austen's supremacy in fiction was posthumous. Walter Bagehot's greatness as an essayist is only now becoming fully recognized. There are, on the other hand, men who make a great stir in their lifetime; great figures before the public eye whose gifts are so brilliant as to place them in the first rank. Yet their influence does not survive their lifetime. Even in their lifetime their energy and persuasiveness are more remarkable than their power of judgment, and they leave no thoughts to guide their successors. They become gradually forgotten when the glamour of their personal presence has disappeared, and another generation may even call in question their title to greatness. Gladstone and Cardinal Manning belonged, I think, to the latter category. Samuel Taylor Coleridge and Cardinal Newman belonged to the former. But with Coleridge and Newman their contemporary fame was very great. So many eminent men were among their disciples that the world, if it did not fully recognize them, did appreciate them up to a certain point. The case of Bishop Hedley is more like that of Walter Bagehot and Bach, who were to a great extent discovered by the world at large after their death. Dr Hedley never held a position in any way parallel to that of Coleridge at Highgate, or Newman at Oxford. And I do not claim for him a place quite in the same rank as either of these two great men. But the depth of his thought, illuminated throughout by all the

Bishop Hedley

traces of a great character, should make him, as his writing becomes more widely known, hold a very high position in the eyes of the serious world which cares for religion.

The especial interest attaching to his work arises largely from his antecedents. He was intellectually a remarkable blend. Trained in the Conservative Benedictine school, a born Catholic, he had the regular scholastic education. Yet, as we read his writings, nothing is more evident than the influence on his mind and on his style of Cardinal Newman. He adopted and developed many of Newman's characteristic trains of reasoning and he assimilated them to older methods of thought and expression. Moreover, I trace largely to the influence of Newman the great openness of mind which is rare in the case of one whose education has been on the entirely technical lines of scholastic philosophy and theology. There are pages in his sermons showing a keen sensitiveness to modern ways of thought, and an understanding sympathy with the agnostic bent of mind. These qualities are to be found indeed in the great schoolmen, notably in St Thomas Aquinas, and also in some degree in Suarez and de Lugo. But their modern successors are generally wanting in this respect. Dr Hedley's sermons are literature, are human, and evince a sympathetic imagination which enabled him to enter into trains of thought widely different from those prevalent in the world in which he lived. For, be it remembered, that he was never like Newman or Coleridge in personal contact with doubters. He led on the whole the secluded life of a monk; it was by reading alone that he became cognisant of modes of thought far removed from his own. It needs a very rare and very sympathetic imagination to realize without personal contact an intellectual world wholly dissimilar to that in which you live. It is one of Bishop Hedley's triumphs that he did so to a remarkable extent. Since his death the present writer has been refreshing his memory of the collection of sermons by the Bishop called *The*

Bishop Hedley

Christian Inheritance, and their power in this respect has come upon him with new force.

The great advantage of a secluded life of prayer is the consistency and unity that it gives; the great disadvantage is the narrowness that often results from seclusion. It was Dr Hedley's triumph that he kept the advantage and completely overcame the disadvantage. There are pages in these sermons which in their power of depicting varieties of thought are worthy of Newman himself. Yet we never find the undue plasticity to which excess of sympathy often leads. He holds firmly and clearly to his own standpoint while he appreciates the mentality of those from whom he differs. Others will deal with closer knowledge than I possess with the details of the Bishop's career, but I propose to say something of these sermons as a contribution to practical religious thought. I use the word "practical" advisedly. They are no dry-as-dust disquisitions; their thought ever touches on the actual. The preacher stops short where thought threatens to become merely speculative. His learning is brought to bear with a wide sweep of imaginative reasoning on the fields which affect practical faith and practical goodness. The note of wisdom arising from that life of meditation which belongs to the Benedictine vocation is apparent throughout.

It has been justly said that the modern world is apt to reject Christianity without understanding it. It is also a trite saying that a little learning is a dangerous thing. The wide reading of the Bishop and his constant brooding thought on the full meaning of the Christian message and the full content of the Christian life stand out in contrast to such superficiality. His views are, in consequence, both deep and wide. He avoids the excess of plasticity which was the ruin of such a writer as Father Tyrrell, yet he never falls short of understanding sympathy. There is great unity and great mellowness of intellect, and the width which comes not only from sympathy with those whose standpoint is far removed from his own, but from knowledge of the immense

Bishop Hedley

variety of thought to be found in the great Catholic writers of the past. Bishop Hedley is keenly alive to modern needs, but he also sees that human nature is ever the same, and that much that is modern is a recurrence of older ways of thinking. A great deal of our present civilisation is a reproduction of the civilisation of the Roman Empire, which had passed away when the mediæval scholastics held their sway. A full acquaintance with the early fathers gives a far wider basis of approved Catholic thought than can be supplied by modern scholastic manuals which, as Lacordaire once said, follow the same beaten track like the guides in a Swiss mountaineering expedition. Thus much which to an impatient apologist whose reading is limited seems to call for new treatment can really be largely dealt with from the storehouse of ancient Catholic wisdom.

The Bishop rests then on this wide basis of ancient Christian thought. Yet his writing is in a true sense original. It has been well said that the greatest triumph of genius is to express old thoughts in a new way, and to give them new reality. Bishop Hedley achieves this in many of his sermons, notably in the sermon on Revelation. He takes the old problem of reason and authority. His general position is that reason is very valuable and effective in recognizing the channels of higher knowledge, but cannot compass that knowledge for itself. The attitude of meditation is effective for this purpose. It opens the mind to descry light from above. The attitude of mere discussion is ineffective. It concentrates on the argumentative processes and does not attend to indications of a higher knowledge beyond its full comprehension. Hence the philosopher who poses as an expert in the science of knowledge may be less successful than the plain man, because his efforts, however skilful, are in a wrong direction. "Man, left to himself," the Bishop writes, "has never doubted that he could hear the voice of God. The universal race of human beings, taking all the earth and all the centuries, has always listened for God. It is only philosophers

Bishop Hedley

who have refined and denied." That is to say, men spontaneously and normally meditate, and meditation leads them to be alive to higher sources of knowledge than mere argument. The philosopher, on the contrary, is apt to argue on his lower plane and not to cultivate those faculties which are really the most important in this connection. This is to some extent equivalent to Coleridge's contrast between the "reason" and the "understanding"—for Coleridge's "reason" does include that meditation which looks upwards.

But while mere thought and argument of the discursive kind are unsuccessful even in the philosopher for the attainment of religious truth, when that philosopher goes on to tell the crowd, who are not thinkers at all, to search for religious truth by the path of their own private thought, the proposal becomes grotesque. On this point Bishop Hedley writes so effectively that my readers will welcome a long quotation :—

"Think,"—say the philosophers and the writers and the crowd of empty journalists who live by dressing up the scraps of the tables of their betters—"think for yourselves. Accept nothing on trust. Your religion will be all the more true and deep." To whom are these words addressed? First, they are addressed to the thousands, the millions, of working men and women who eat their bread by the sweat of their brow. They are addressed to the illiterate poor in the cities and towns, in the fields, the factories, the docks, the mines; to the men and women who read with difficulty, and even if they read cannot put one premiss to another; and who, even if they could read and could reason, have to work hard from morning till night. What a mockery to tell a working man—the anxious breadwinner of a family, who walks out to his work in the morning hardly refreshed, and comes home at night tired out with toil—what a mockery to tell him he must devote his mind to find out whether there is a God, whether he has an immortal soul, and whether there is life after death! Hard grinding labour, from the morning when they rise reluctantly to the evening when they sink down again, weary and overcome, to eat, and then to sleep—is this a school where men can settle these deep questions of spiritual truth?

And if you go higher in the scale, and take the classes that are

Bishop Hedley

better off and have more leisure, the mockery is still the same. Look through all the grades of the great middle class, from the well-to-do artisan to the member of a learned profession ; think how full of work their life is, how busy their brains and hands ; remember how all the world over it is the condition of a country's advancement and prosperity that the immense majority of its citizens dedicate their best and longest hours to the production in one shape or another of wealth ; reflect that you probably do not know one man in this class whose opinion you would take as decisive in any matter outside his own business ; and then say whether it would not be a wild delusion to suppose that from these busy workers there could come any clear or adequate system of natural theology or natural law. Invite them to prove the existence of God, to lay down what is virtue and what is vice, or to formulate a definition of immortal life, and you mock them. They have to live in the world. Their minds are full of money ; they have ventures at home and abroad ; their days are mapped out ; they study the secrets of science ; they are working the mills and the printing presses, the making, the counting, and the carrying of this unresting world. Teach them ; let truth be offered to them, and they will look at it ; they will most likely recognise it when they see it ; but do not mock them by asking them to supply a darkened world with its necessary light.

Here it may be noted that we have in eloquent form the argument used by St. Thomas Aquinas in the fourth chapter of his *Summa Contra Gentiles*. . Modern scholastics are sometimes shy of admitting the existence of any road but that of philosophical reason to the knowledge of the truths of natural religion, but St. Thomas Aquinas, the great philosopher of Theism, points out quite clearly that in practice philosophical reason is wholly inadequate. In memorable words he declares that if only the path of philosophical reason were open to mankind in order to obtain the knowledge of God "only a few would ever attain to it, and that with difficulty and after a long time." This pregnant truth which St. Thomas uttered in the thirteenth century Dr. Hedley emphasised in the nineteenth. The true road to all religious knowledge, as both writers point out, is that of teaching. Where a higher truth is taught the human spirit responds to it

Bishop Hedley

by a kind of instinct, and evidence for its truth is found largely in the response of the human mind and in the effect of what is taught in developing and enlarging it.

It does not debase or humiliate the human spirit to be taught. Rather, my spirit cannot realise itself until it hears a voice. Like the eye of the eagle, it kindles in the beam of the rising sun. Like the plain, the forest, and the ocean, it is only in its beauty when that sun has risen. How the earth answers the challenge of the sun ! The vast surface leaps to meet the beam, and shows its new life in a thousand changing tints ; the hills rejoice, the sea spreads out its royalty ; the leafy kingdoms tremble, the brown earth smiles, the deserts glow ; a thousand voices dumb before are heard, a thousand fires are lighted up, a thousand rills and springs run lavishly. So it is with your heart and mind. They never live till the Spirit shines upon them.

Again Dr. Hedley insists with graphic force on the fact that revelation makes deep and clear and definite the lines which human reason may trace indeed faintly, but may be unequal to tracing firmly. The earlier thought I have noted was that of Aquinas, this last thought was a favourite one with Cardinal Newman. But, here again, Dr. Hedley puts the case with a power and originality of his own in the following passage :

God, conscience, responsibility, the sense of right and wrong—these are rooted in the human mind, and to pluck them up would be to destroy the mind. But conceptions are like lights at sea ; they may be there in the lighthouse and they may be alive, but if the fogs come on the mariner he sees them not. And the mind breeds its fogs like the sea. Hence comes that which is so familiar to every one who follows the history of man—that discord and that divergence among minds which are kindled all of them by the same divinely-spiced ray of light. What is God ? What is life ? Have I a spiritual soul ? Is there immortality ? On these things there is in every man the ground and possibility of certainty. But if he is to be certain, certain before it is too late, certain without a labour he will never undergo, certain and yet able to live his daily life—for this there must be a voice from the outside, clear, precise, and unmistakable. There must be a sign from Heaven. Even as regards those spiritual truths as

Bishop Hedley

to which a man may have assurance without Revelation, yet Revelation is needed for that steady and practical certainty without which the brightest transient flashes of insight are useless for the purposes of human life.

One of the most remarkable sermons in this volume deals with a subject very different from that of faith and reason. I refer to the sermon on Brotherly Love. Bishop Hedley enters his protest against the false philanthropy of a modern generation which divorces the love of man from the love of God. He dreads the lowering of the whole scale of altruism which would be the consequence. He is eager to draw up rules for Christian philanthropy as apposite to our own generation as was the Franciscan vocation to those who lived in the thirteenth century. If Christian philanthropy is not developed so as to suit the needs of the age, philanthropy will fall into the hands of non-Christians and will be debased. "As each generation waxes and wanes," he writes, "as fresh circumstances develop and fresh needs arise—the precious words of the Sermon on the Mount must be interpreted in the language which the age understands. They must not be left to the pitiful rhetoric and the discordant sciolism of men without the faith of Christ."

There are two propositions on which he insists with eloquence. The first is that the test of a genuine love of God is to be found in the practical love of his fellow-men which a Christian shows. The second is that it is the endeavour to imitate Christ and to rise to His largeness of heart and His width of sympathy which transfigures philanthropy and gives it the great scale which we see in such devoted lives as those of St. Vincent de Paul, St. Peter Claver, and St. Camillus de Lellis. On these two points we must allow ourselves extracts of considerable length, for no summary will do justice to the Bishop's thought :

The love of God in a man's heart is demonstrated, and, as it were, certified by kindness to men. For it is very easy for a

Bishop Hedley

man to deceive himself as to his real love of God unless he translates his spiritual affections into deeds. What passes for real love of the Heavenly Father may easily be only sentiment, or vacuity, or even sloth and self-seeking. Many a one knows the danger of this in himself, and suspects it in other people. What visions of devotion, what scenes of heroism, what deep and beautiful thoughts of heaven, sometimes float before the idle contemplations of a thoroughly selfish man! But rouse him—touch him with the spear's tip of the Angel—and his airy fancies vanish like smoke, and nothing is left but the noisome sight of self crawling off to hide itself. The best of men want a touch of this kind—not once, but every day. And this is what brotherly love does. That great commandment stands over you and me, my brethren. It says, Do something, or do not pretend you love God! Try to do some good, or your piety is a sham! Open your purse, or do not flatter yourself that you are a man of prayer! Take an interest in human trouble and suffering, or the Church services you enjoy so much will not bring you any nearer Heaven! Be kind, considerate, gentle, and helpful to those in your home and your circle, or the largest number of the most devout prayer-books will be no shield at the judgment, no rampart in the day of visitation!

The Bishop's second thought, which goes even deeper, is set forth with great eloquence in the following passage:—

Oh for the great Christian grace to put ourselves in others' places! This is the grand element of that Christian "altruism" which the Gospel enforces. It begins with our transforming our own heart into the likeness of the Heart of Christ. That heart is the precious object of our love, of our worship here and hereafter. But it brings with it a whole universe besides itself. It brings the hearts of the whole human race: the hearts of all men and women, with their histories, their good, their evil, their joys, their sorrows. All these has Jesus taken into His Heart from the beginning. All these He had in His Heart at Gethsemane and on the Cross. No one of His friends can take that Heart into their own bosom without taking at the same time all that it holds and carries. Therefore, from the moment when that Heart begins to grow, strongly, really, and sensibly, within us, we begin to have all human beings in our heart. We begin to find it easier to enter into their lot, whatever it may be, to

Bishop Hedley

sympathise with them, to understand how in this or that they must rejoice or must suffer, and to comprehend what a live drama, what interests, what stakes, what catastrophes, are being acted out close at hand, even under the mask of every-day faces and every-day circumstances. This is that "enlargement" of the human heart of which St. Paul speaks. No Christian brotherly love is possible without it. You cannot love those whom you do not care for. The Roman of old passed through his stately halls, and was carried over his broad fields; and as his servants swarmed around him, near his person and at a distance, all ministering to his wants, he viewed them as the dust beneath his feet; to him neither their souls nor their bodies were of any account; at night they were swept into their *ergastula* like cattle, and at death flung into the fire. And it was the social revolution which Christian brotherhood wrought that made this kind of servitude impossible and that indirectly sapped the very foundations of Roman civilisation. You cannot love those whom you do not care for. What is it makes you refuse to become acquainted with the poor or the suffering? Is it fastidiousness? Then trample it down, and take yourselves to poor bedsides, and approach where wretchedness is. For you will there find brothers and sisters. Is it thoughtlessness? Then, in heaven's name, begin to think! For you are not only repudiating Christ, but you are making it dangerous for the whole social order. Whether you think or not, there the things are; there is poverty, disease, and discontent. You may shut your eyes, but that will not conjure them away. But shut them not! Look before you, and advance to find out with complete knowledge all that reality has to show you. Shirk nothing. Make no pretences. Look unpleasantness in the face. If you need not go into the slums of great cities, at least be acquainted with your own neighbourhood. Be not a stranger to want and sickness. Visit the poor man out of work, the weak and overtasked mother, the poor neglected children. Find out the shy and shamefaced victims of poverty, who lead a life of starvation. It is not the priest only whose office it is to know these things. It is the duty also of all of us, according to a certain rule of prudence and obedience. One effect of the knowledge, at first hand, of the dark and suffering side of human existence, will be to make every one of us more ready and better prepared to enter into and to support schemes, large or small, for the alleviation of poverty and for fighting with disease. As to such schemes, no doubt they are sometimes

Bishop Hedley

foolish, and nearly always contain some drawback—in their authors, their advocates or their conditions. But disagreeable as these things are, counsel must be taken, plans must be planned, measures must be carried through; or else we, to whose charge God has given the poor (I mean all of us, seculars and clergy alike), will fail in our duty. Blessed is he that understandeth concerning the poor and the needy!

I have cited enough, I hope, for my purpose. Such pages as the above bring before us a great mind and a great soul. One feels that the writing is the expression of the whole man. A holy Benedictine is imparting to others the fruits of his life of meditation—that spiritual wisdom which only a holy life can beget. The insight is not merely intellectual: it is spiritual. The sermons are the fruits of the *donum sapientiæ*.

We have lost in Bishop Hedley almost the last link with the memorable past in England that immediately succeeded the Oxford Movement. His name will stand alongside of those of Newman, Wiseman, and Manning. But a great Benedictine suggests also a far more ancient line of succession, and we have lost one who was well worthy to perpetuate the traditions of that illustrious order which took possession of the ruins of the old Roman Empire and inaugurated the Christian civilisation. That civilisation is now decaying, but the Benedictine spirit is likely to prove a source of strength in this time of trial as it was a creative force in those early days when the decay of old Imperial Rome led so many to see in the Church the centre of a future Christian Empire which was to take its place.

WILFRID WARD.

GERMAN CATHOLICS AND THE WAR

La Conversion d'un Catholique Germanophile. Lettre Ouverte de M. Emile Prüm à M. Mathias Erzberger. Traduction intégrale de la Lettre Ouverte. Poursuites judiciaires intentées à M. Prüm. L'Evolution Pangermaniste du Centre Catholique Allemand. Par René Johannet. Paris, Bibliothèque des Ouvrages Documentaires. Pp. 192. Price 2 francs.

Le Danger pour l'Eglise est en Allemagne. Par le Chanoine B. Gudeau. Paris, Bureau de la "Foi Catholique." Pp. 64. Price, 1 franc net.

MORE painful by far in the present war than material ruin or physical suffering and death is the loosing of passions which tear the moral unity of mankind. And to the Catholic especially, who sees members of his Church in opposed camps, bent on mutual destruction, is the position acutely painful. We have always felt strong admiration for the German Catholics. From the struggles of the *Kulturkampf* they appeared to us to emerge wearing the halo of martyrdom. By patience and fidelity they had triumphed over the ambitious apostle of force, Bismarck, who had sought with blood and iron to found a new German Empire, anti-Roman and very doubtfully Holy. We admired their work of social organization and reform, and the labours of their scholars and apologists. At their annual Congresses foreign Catholics were wont to attend and learn from them lessons of thoroughness, energy, enthusiasm. "Germania docet" became almost a proverb amongst Continental Catholics.

Moreover, they had compelled recognition of the rights of Catholics to be counted as true citizens of their country. Though still subjected to many injustices in their public life—for instance, in the Prussian army, in higher education, and in regard to the free development of their Religious Orders—German Catholics

German Catholics and the War

had come to fill a large place in the national life. It was no longer possible to regard them, with Bismarck, as mere "Guelphs," belated "mediævalists," or slaves of an Italian potentate. They had become loyalists to the core, whole-hearted supporters of the new Empire, and they took pleasure in declaring their position in this regard. The Emperor multiplied his public testimonies of good-will—while showing from time to time in private signs of a fierce antipathy to the Catholic religion—and for several years past has known that he could count with certainty upon the support of the Centre.

That there were disquieting signs, particularly on the politico-ecclesiastical side, long before the outbreak of the war, is sufficiently known. They are pretty thoroughly canvassed by both M. Johannet and Canon Gaudeau in the works cited at the head of this article, and more will be said of some of them below. We cannot associate ourselves with quite all that our authors say, but it is hardly necessary for us to declare our profound sympathy with their general position, and our sense of the value of the very significant stories they have to tell in the able and well-documented books that lie before us. M. Johannet's is of especial interest as illustrating a movement of opinion which we believe and trust is growing amongst the Catholics of neutral countries. He tells us the story of the "conversion" of a prominent statesman of a neutral country from an attitude of reliance upon organized German Catholicism as an international power for good to an attitude quite different. Presuppositions about "atheistic France," "heretical England," or "schismatical Russia," or about the piety of Wilhelm II and his zeal as a Protector of the Church—such things turned out under the stress of facts to be but of little weight with a Catholic and neutral observer who lived near enough to the scene of action to know what was really going on.

For the country concerned is the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg and the statesman is the leader of its

German Catholics and the War

Catholic party, M. Emile Prüm. This little nation, patriarchal, pious for the most part, and hostile to all forms of oppression, had until recent years suffered from no serious political conflicts. But some few years ago a growing industrialization of certain districts was accompanied by the appearance of a good deal of activity on the part of anti-clericals and the *Internationale*. Unfortunately, France has to bear some of the responsibility for this, and subsequent events have afforded a very teaching example of the way in which evil deeds will sometimes recoil upon the heads of those who commit them. Anyhow, very few of the Luxemburgois appreciated the meaning of what was going on, or understood the necessity of social and political organization for the maintenance of the national traditions and for the defence of social morals and of the Church. But among these few was M. Prüm, a manufacturer and for many years Mayor of the little town of Clervaux, to whose interests he had sedulously devoted his life. In touch with the principal Catholic leaders of Germany and Belgium, and well acquainted with Catholic movements in France and other countries, he saw early the necessity for such organization, and soon became the recognized and energetic leader of an opposition to the anti-clerical forces which had already gone far towards gaining full control of the Government. Of course, he immediately became the object of virulent personal attacks, even in regard to his admirably Christian private life. His vindication, however, was speedy and complete. The services which he rendered to the Catholic cause were recognized by Popes Leo XIII and Pius X, who bestowed on him many marks of confidence and esteem, and he himself became known and trusted in foreign countries, particularly after his appearance as one of the most notable and successful of the lay speakers at the Eucharistic Congress at Metz.

M. Prüm thought at first that a small country, largely German in speech, where French sympathies had apparently only served as a cover for the introduction of the

German Catholics and the War

"bloc" and its anti-Christian activities, should seek for its social organization the support of one of the groups of the German Centre, and, indeed, affiliation with it. Like many others, he put great faith in organized German Catholicism, and, indeed, in a general German, non-Prussianised culture, sympathetic, or at least not hostile, to the Catholic Church. How his ideals fared will be shown in the sequel.

The other protagonist in M. Johannet's drama is Herr Matthias Erzberger. Of this gentleman M. Johannet gives us a vivid sketch in his preface. He seems to have begun life as an elementary schoolmaster somewhere in Swabia, and having entered the Reichstag in 1903 at the age of twenty-eight as a deputy of the Centre, he soon pushed himself to the front as its most popular figure and spokesman, though not officially its leader. According to M. Johannet :

travailleur acharné, caractère violent, tempérament sanguin, après avoir combattu avec emphase le gouvernement impérial, M. Erzberger en est devenu bien vite le serviteur acharné. Rapporteur des budgets de la guerre, de la marine et des colonies, il a souvent adopté une attitude semi-pangermaniste que la guerre devait transformer en pangermanisme ultra et sans conditions.

To this personage M. Prüm, early this year, delivered his mind upon the subject of German political Catholicism as it had lately revealed itself, and published his reflections in the form of an open letter * addressed to him. Upon the demand of the German officials at present unlawfully ruling the Grand Duchy, the pamphlet was promptly seized by the police. Legal proceedings followed of which no clear account is available. It seems that Herr. Erzberger sued M. Prüm for libel,

* First published in the *Clerfjer Echo*, and in the *Fortschritt* of Diekirch, and issued later as a pamphlet : *Die deutsche Kriegführung in Belgien und die Mahnungen Benedict XV. offenes Schreiben an Hrn. Math. Erzberger, Reichstagsabgeordneter in Berlin*. Von Emil Prüm, Bürgermeister zu Clerf (Grossherzogtum Luxemburg). Dietrich, P. Cariers, 1915.

German Catholics and the War

and that the action was put not so much on a personal basis as on grounds comparable to those of our proceedings in regard to criminal libel. They were largely based on a provision in the Luxemburg code which decrees penalties against anyone "who by actions not approved by Government lays the State open to hostilities from a Foreign Power." The principal motive force behind the prosecution, however, was undoubtedly personal, and Herr Erzberger, whom the open letter had touched on the raw, was the person. But there is only too much reason to suppose that the proceedings were also not unwelcome to M. Prüm's political opponent M. Eyschen, "the Waldeck-Rousseau of Luxemburg"—a fact which unpleasantly illustrates what, even at a time like this, the anti-Clericalism of the *Internationale* may mean. The latest news at the time of writing, in December, 1915, is that M. Prüm is incarcerated in a Luxemburg gaol at the instance of his eminent co-religionist, Herr Erzberger. So passes M. Prüm out of the story. Of Herr Erzberger we shall yet have more than enough.

The material embodied in the two books before us affords a useful opportunity for a brief survey and estimate of the attitude adopted during the course of the present troubles by those who represent themselves as the leaders of Catholic Germany. It is hardly to be wondered at if individual Catholics, and particularly Belgians, experienced a painful astonishment at finding that no voice from the Centre was raised in protest or even in reservation when on August 4th, 1914, the Chancellor of the Empire announced to the Reichstag that, driven by "necessity," Germany was violating the neutrality of the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg and of Belgium; and that, again, at the meeting in November the Centre still kept silence. As M. Prüm very justly says :

No one expected, nor would it have been reasonable to expect, that in the sudden and gigantic crisis the Centre and the Catholic population of Germany should have allowed itself to be surpassed

German Catholics and the War

by any other section or party of the nation in patriotism, in self-sacrifice, or even in military ardour. But the Centre ought in any case to have reserved the *question of right*.

The issue, as he points out, was governed for Catholics by the principles of morals in general, as well as by the pronouncements of Popes (as in the 64th proposition in the Syllabus of Pius IX.) and the judgments of endless professors of moral theology among the Germans themselves. One thing at least is plain, and that is that political leaders of the Centre, who have knowledge of the facts and of the issues at stake, and have not merely allowed to pass without protest, but have openly defended and even glorified the German Government's violations of treaties, have, so far, incurred the charge of being bad Catholics, disloyal to the Church and to its Head upon earth. This is the charge which really seems to have stung Herr Erzberger into throwing M. Prüm into gaol.

Of course, *nemo repente fuit turpissimus*, and the Catholic Centre has a past—of late years not entirely an edifying one. It has become to-day, and has for some years been in process of becoming, a very different thing from the "Union of the Catholic Populations of Germany," founded in 1870 by Bishop Kettler, von Mallinkrodt, the brothers Reichensperger and Windhorst, who put religion and justice above everything else, while bringing them into harmony with the duties of a true patriotism. The unpleasant story of its gradual transformation into an "interconfessional"—that is to say, an undenominational party, and of the consequent and indeed almost inevitable, submersion of its religion in its politics, is told pretty fully in M. Johannet's chapter, *L'Evolution pangermaniste du Centre Catholique Allemand*. Enough of the facts has been recorded from time to time in our own Catholic Press to make it unnecessary to go into the story in detail. For fifteen years we have seen the Centre, "once Catholic," as M. Prüm bitterly notes, split into two camps, that of Berlin and that of Cologne—

German Catholics and the War

Berlin the centre of "integral" Catholicism, Cologne of "interconfessional"; Berlin telling Cologne "you are no longer Christians," Cologne rejoining "you are ruining Catholic unity." There were difficulties of personality and faults of temper on both sides, and an abundant crop of extremely disedifying incidents, which it would do no good to revive in these pages. But the broad fact remains that under the influence of Cologne the Centre has become no longer an organisation for Catholic defence, but an undenominational political party, and, what is more, the docile instrument of the Berlin Government and of its pan-Germanism in the extremest form. The mischief began when men of the type of Windhorst, champions of the rights of nationalities, of creeds, of minorities, upholders pre-eminently of ideals, were succeeded by men like Lieber, above all things "Government men," men of *real-politik*, and when leaders of a powerful opposition were content to range themselves in the train of the King of Prussia and his half-Christianised hordes from the ill-gotten territories of the first apostate Hohenzollern. It is not the first time that sensational successes at the polls have turned the heads of politicians.

A crucial point arose more particularly with the question of the Workmen's Unions, when from 1894 onwards a determined effort was made by the Centre, under the Emperor's personal pressure, to push the system of undenominational *Christliche Gewerkschaften* to the exclusion of all definitely Catholic organisations. A matter like this must be judged by Continental and not by English standards. The action of the Centre would not be parallel with the practice of English Catholics who work with trades unions of which the scope is expressly confined to secular concerns. It was action in a mixed matter which may be illustrated from our own problems, by supposing an organisation of Catholics which should, influenced by considerations of political alliance, in spite of the wishes of the ecclesiastical authorities and contrary to general Catholic

German Catholics and the War

feeling, throw over the Catholic school system in favour of some sort of participation in undenominational education. Years of bitter contention were concluded only by a Papal Encyclical * which "tolerated provisionally" the undenominational unions, while expressing a strong preference on every ground for associations of a purely Catholic character. Of course the decision was loyally accepted. What the Pope "tolerates" it is not for individual Catholics to disallow. But also, when the Pope expresses preferences which in the sequel are disregarded and foretells dangers which have only too surely come to pass, Catholics have the right to feel aggrieved against the organisation responsible for the mischief.

After the *Singulari quadam* things went from bad to worse with German Catholicism as a political force. Cologne captured the Centre, as a going concern, and with it the whole effective public representation of Catholics in politics and in the Press. That it captured it for undenominationalism is hardly denied; indeed it is pleaded that from the first Windhorst never intended his party to be a "Catholic political party," but "a political party pledged to see justice done to Catholics," and that from the first he welcomed the aid of Protestants and admitted them to membership. The fact is that what, under Windhorst, was meant as an exceptional provision to meet rare and exceptional cases, has been made a general principle, to the complete subversion of all Windhorst's plans. Even as late as 1907 there was but one non-Catholic deputy of the Centre out of 109. By 1909 Herr Julius Bechem, a person of varied career who had worked himself into the position of general wire-puller behind the party caucus, was calmly proposing, for certain political advantages to be received in exchange, to ear-mark fifty of the safest Centre seats for Protestant candidates. The proposal raised a storm throughout Catholic Germany, the upshot of which was simply the expulsion or resignation of certain trusted

* *Singulari quadam*, September 24th, 1912.

German Catholics and the War

and leading Catholics, and the imposition of a test which once and for all made clear the "interconfessionalism" of the party. At last, on February 8th, 1914, the caucus of the Centre issued a declaration roundly stating that the party is not a Catholic party, but going on to claim that it is the party to which Catholics ought to belong; that they ought to submit themselves to its politics, and that if their conscience forbids this, it is their duty to keep silence, for the sake of unity and discipline. The *Augustinus Verein*, the powerful Press association of the Centre, has followed this up by requiring subscription to this test on the part of all its members, under pain of expulsion. It now habitually uses the term "Centrist" instead of "Catholic." But it still remains the *Augustinus Verein zur Pflege der katholischen Presse*.

Needless to say, the submergence of the religion of the Centre in its politics has carried the results in regard to Catholic defence which one would expect. Movements for the extension of the Faith and for the removal of disabilities from Religious Orders have been frowned down. The University question has been side-tracked. The Polish question also has been grievously mishandled. Fine words, but in practice a craven acquiescence, chiefly characterised the attitude of the Centre during the abominable persecution to which for so long the Poles have been subjected at the hands of their Prussian masters. When in August, 1914, a sudden change took place, and the Kaiser Wilhelm began violently to woo the Poles, the Centre arose as one man to the rescue. A perfectly scandalous document,* couched in the language of Catholic devotion, and accompanied by "holy pictures," and by an illustration representing a gentle Prussian soldier prostrate at the feet of Our Lady of Czenstochowa, was scattered broadcast in Poland by the Centre, calling upon the Slavs to rally round the standard of their Prussian

* Johannet, pp. 23-25, quoting the *Historisch-Politische Blätter*, a Munich organ of the Centre.

German Catholics and the War

saviours, and embodying the amazing statement that the King of Prussia never had had, and never would have, anything but the profoundest respect for the religion of the Poles and for their complete liberty to enjoy and to practise it.

As a matter of fact the Centre has gained nothing either for this world or for the next by its defection from the standards of the seventies, and by surrendering its enormously powerful position as holding for so long, like the Irish Party, the balance between parties while committed to none. On the one hand it has divided Catholics and drawn upon itself suspicion so grave as to have moved Cardinal Kopp once to use in its regard so grave a term as "infection." On the other side it has simply tied itself to the chariot-wheels of a Protestant ascendancy party.* The only result of the submergence of the Centre in undenominational politics has been that

the ruling circles of Germany are now neither Catholic nor favourable to any religion. In Germany it is Protestantism that sets the tone. The aid of Catholics is sought, especially when there is something unpleasant to be done, but they are given no share in the direction of affairs. . . . In Germany Catholics are but citizens "of the second degree." †

Such are the complaints even of men like Herr Rost and Herr Bechem, and so far has the work of Windhorst and his friends been undone. It was, indeed, an evil day when German Catholicism came forth, at the bidding of a few politicians who had given themselves over to the Hohenzollern, from the "tower of ivory" their great leader had built. The lesson is worth taking to heart in a country in which Catholics have been several times very loudly invited by short-sighted people to tie themselves up with one or the other of the political parties. We may be grateful that the advice

* Johannet, pp. 183-4.

† Even in Catholic Bavaria, where the proportion of public offices held by non-Catholics is a scandal of long standing.

German Catholics and the War

was not taken, and that we retain our freedom to act as a united body in the defence of Catholic interests whenever need may arise, and in whatever manner may seem best. Anyhow, the German Centre, once a Catholic force, even if not a "Catholic party," is now neither. But when it or the Berlin Government finds it convenient, it is ready enough to trade upon its reputation as such. Thus at one moment Herr Erzberger poses in the columns of the *Volkszeitung* as the Complete Bernhardist, and at another appears at Rome as the Complete Catholic, the emissary of the party of Windhorst, and his heir.

The Centre, "once Catholic," did indeed fail in the time of crisis. The fine fruit of those years of evil germination is to be seen to-day in the pages of the Cologne *Volkszeitung*, in the performances of Herr Erzberger and in those of his competitor in savagery, Herr Martin Spahn. The former, in an article early this year in *Der Tag*, laid it down that in war, "if one would conduct it intelligently," one must be "utterly unscrupulous":

If one can destroy London by any known method, to do so is much more humane than to let a single German soldier lose his life on the field of battle, since a cure so radical would lead to a more speedy peace. To hesitate and to temporize, to yield to sentimentality and considerateness is unpardonable weakness.

Moreover, in Herr Erzberger's opinion, nothing in warfare should be spared, "neither churches, nor women, nor children, nor the aged." That he should also have distinguished himself by a special virulence of language towards Catholic Belgium is perhaps not surprising, however lamentable.

Forgiveness to the injured doth belong,
But they ne'er pardon who have done the wrong,

and Herr Erzberger—a statesman in the inner councils of the Berlin Government—had done a very special wrong

German Catholics and the War

to Belgium. For he had, less than twelve months before the invasion, used his credit as a Catholic for the express purpose of deceiving her in regard to her danger. He had, in fact, authorized the *Journal de Bruxelles* to declare in its issue of August 26, 1913, that

M. Erzberger nous apporte sa parole d'honneur en faisant de sa veracité comme catholique un cas de conscience, que dans les communications les plus secrètes jamais il n'a été question d'envahir la Belgique ni de menacer en aucune manière la sécurité de son territoire. . . . La Belgique peut toujours compter sur le parti du Centre du Reichstag qui travaille à faire respecter les engagements internationaux.

Considering what is now known of German plans and preparations, we may judge what weight attaches to Herr Erzberger's "word of honour" and his conscience "as a Catholic."

Herr Martin Spahn, too, is apparently determined not to be outdone by Herr Erzberger. This "Catholic" professor, the collaborateur of the apostate ex-Jesuit Count von Hoensbroeck, who in 1910 had been forced by the caucus of the Centre upon an unwilling Catholic electorate, to the great scandal of the faithful, published in May, 1915, a pan-Germanist pamphlet, *Im Kampf um unsere Zukunft*. Of this production it is only necessary to say that it out-does even Bernhardt, alike in the general immorality of its principles, and in its application of them to the particular circumstances of the present war.

The Catholic Press of Germany has, of course, been thoroughly poisoned. It has been distinguished, even in Germany, for the especial virulence of its language. The exhibitions of the Cologne *Volkszeitung* are by this time well known in England. We may take another example from the letter of M. Prüm :

Turn over, for example, a collection of the *Leo*, a Sunday paper for the German people, edited by the Bonifazius Society of Paderborn, of which more than 100,000 copies are distributed in Westphalia. The stories, resting on no basis of truth at all,

German Catholics and the War

told therein concerning Belgian *franc-tireurs* are absolutely outrageous. Thus this publication, intended for the edification of the populace, announces in its issue for the 12th Sunday after Pentecost that, even before the war, Belgians had put out the eyes of Germans with kitchen-knives, that a German butcher in Brussels had had his head cut off and had been torn to pieces; that another, a tradesman, had been quartered alive. Naturally, these stories of brigandage end with the menace: Belgium shall pay dearly for these atrocities! In its 32nd number this Catholic religious paper provokes almost directly the assassination of foreign princes. On page 330 we read: "How often has the Catholic Church been reproached with permitting the murder of tyrants! But to-day the question is pressing: Should we not have done better if we had hung on the nearest tree half-a-dozen of these Russian Grand Dukes who have urged on war?"

At this stage our readers will be glad at last to come upon some sign that the spirit of Catholicism and Christianity still exists in Germany. This is a point to which we have perforce been long in coming, but to which we hope to do the fullest justice. Naturally we have not been allowed to know much of any movements of protest which may have manifested themselves among the best Catholics, unrepresented politically, of Germany. But enough has leaked out to show that there are some things which even German docility, in a Catholic, will not stand. We know, for instance, that the Bishop of Hildesheim has had to protest against the boycotting of, and even the offering of violence to, Catholic workmen by their Protestant fellows, on the ground of the alleged "atrocities committed upon German troops by Belgian priests and monks." It is pleasing to know, too, that the *Pax Verein*, the excellent Catholic Defence Association established at Aachen in 1912, has investigated and has repudiated *in toto* these charges. Moreover the famous German Jesuit, Father Duhr, author of the well-known *Jesuitenfabeln*, felt called upon, a few months ago, to issue a pamphlet of protest. We greatly regret that, in spite of efforts through neutral countries, we have been unable to get possession of a copy of his *Lügengeist im Voelker-*

German Catholics and the War

krieg, but the general nature of its contents has become known in this country.* It seems to have contained a good deal that was mistaken and wrong-headed, but it is at least significant as showing that there are limits to what, even at a time like this, the best German opinion will tolerate from its political leaders. At any rate it emphatically corroborates the denials Cardinal Mercier and Bishop Heylen of Namur have issued of the incredible calumnies brought against the Belgian clergy.

There is no doubt, however, that German Catholicism as represented by its political spokesmen and its Press—we carefully do not say German Catholics as individuals or as a whole—shows itself deeply infected with the anti-Christian and immoral philosophy that underlies the dominant type of Germanism. At any rate, the reproach of silent acquiescence in the face of an anti-Christian propaganda must be pressed against leaders and Press alike. As M. Prüm writes :

the Press of the Centre, absorbed in its anxiety to defend inter-confessionalism and nationalism, cannot escape the reproach of having failed especially to oppose the free-thinking movement. Monist and free-thinking unions have become an alarming intellectual power in Germany, and this development has been almost ignored by the Press of the Centre. No doubt free-thought has also been very active in Latin countries. But there it lacks German thoroughness. It must also be observed that, since the "free-thought" of Latin countries has taken anti-militarism and international pacifism as its basis, the war has caused its credit to decline greatly in France. German free-thought, on the other hand, is saturated with Nietzschean ideas, and has devoted itself to the service of pan-Germanism.

No doubt, adds M. Prüm, very justly,

it is not those good German Catholic soldiers who tell their beads in the trenches and whose piety has often edified the population, it is not these that have been bred on these perverse doctrines. But neither is it they who direct the military operations.

* See *The Times*, August 11, 1915, and *The Month*, September, 1915 p. 301.

German Catholics and the War

In view of such a position as has been adopted, or acquiesced in, by the spokesmen of the Centre, and the shocking language with which they have supported it, it is not surprising that French and Belgian Catholics should also have strong feelings, and express them strongly. Canon Gaudeau's book, however, full as it is of important and well-documented matter, meriting the attention of all Catholics, goes to lengths which we cannot at all follow. We should be the last to minimize the gravity of the scandal which the Centre, its leaders and its Press, have given and are giving to the Catholic world. Nor are we in the least blind to the solidarity of German Catholics to-day in support of their Prussian masters, or its significance. But we interpret the latter somewhat differently from Canon Gaudeau, and even, in some particulars, from M. Prüm. And as regards the former, we have no doubt that the mass of German Catholicism is innocently deceived, besides being largely voiceless in the councils of its nation. At any rate we are convinced that the Canon is mistaken in attempting, on the strength of a few errant excursions of not very prominent Germans in the direction of Modernism, to affix on cultured Teutonic Catholicism generally some stigma in that regard, also to trace from Luther and Kant to modern Pan-Germanism a certain subjectivism in philosophy and morals which is responsible for "*l'état lamentable de la religion en Allemagne, et dans tous les milieux.*" We quote this sentence of the Canon's and italicize its concluding phrase, because it seems to us a typical piece of ill-balanced and unhelpful controversy. This kind of thing does not help the truth, and does not help the moral, juridical and political case, impregnable when properly stated, of the Allies. German Catholicism is not, in the sense indicated, in a "lamentable state," though in another aspect we have found only too sad reason to consider it so.

There is a distinction in these matters, which in the turmoil of a time like this we are perhaps all of us too apt to forget. Throughout the whole course of her history

German Catholics and the War

the Church has suffered much in the politico-ecclesiastical sphere from her own children—from attitudes adopted towards her, hardly distinguishable from disloyalty, or at any rate bearing the appearance of a preferential loyalty towards nation or race. Yet nearly always these difficulties have passed away, as though, to adopt a metaphor from medicine, such maladies were benignant in comparison with the cancerous growth of disloyalty in regard to doctrine. We in England have had our Cisalpines, and they have ceased to be. France has had her Gallicans, and they too have ceased to be. Josephism, Pombalism, and many another name of unsavoury reputation will at once occur to our readers. However disquieting, even for several years before the war, may have been the signs of an un-Catholic nationalism in powerful Catholic circles across the Rhine—signs which explain a great deal that we see to-day—they may be quite sufficiently interpreted from many chapters in the Church's past without seeking an explanation in any general loosening in Germany from the Faith itself.

It is curious to notice what light some of the Germans themselves—even generations ago—have thrown upon the point. We imagine that even Canon Gaudeau himself would hardly throw doubt upon the Catholicism of Goerres. Yet that great protagonist of the Catholic cause habitually used language about the "sacerdotal vocation" of the Germanic people as the heirs of the Holy Roman Empire, and about the worthlessness of any Catholicism to be found outside its borders, except at Rome, which would have done credit to the most violent Pan-Germanist of to-day.* Indeed, he seems to have gone even farther, and anticipated some of the favourite expressions of Wilhelm II as to the particular proprietorship Germans may presume themselves to have in the Deity Himself—though perhaps we need not interpret every such phrase *au pied de la lettre*. One may also draw further instruction from the unhappy events of 1870 and

* See Georges Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse*, Paris, 1914, Vol. I, pp. 233-234.

German Catholics and the War

1871. As M. Georges Goyau sets forth in his great book *Bismarck et L'Eglise*,* every effort was made by the man of blood and iron to turn Catholicism in Germany into a national sect. We know what happened—how a few great men fell but German Catholicism remained, in spite of every effort which a powerful State could bring to bear towards the bolstering up of the “Old Catholic” schism; how a foiled and angry statesman then had recourse to the *Kulturkampf*; and how at last there was nothing left for him to do but go to Canossa. We shall do well to bear these things in mind. Where a Bismarck failed an *Erzberger* is hardly likely to succeed, though doubtless he may cause a good deal of trouble for a time, and do a very good deal of quite sufficiently serious mischief. The plain fact is that where these political and racial difficulties occur, not seriously complicated by grave abuses within the fold, they come to nothing, as all Catholic history shows, when once the political or racial difficulties have been composed. Of Germany, as of the world in general, the Augustinian maxim is true, *securus judicat orbis terrarum*; or, as Lincoln put it, “You can fool some of the people all the time, and all the people some of the time, but you can’t fool all the people all the time.” The people may be misled and misinformed for a time as to the issues at stake, and leaders or political organisations may have lent themselves only too inexcusably to the evil work of misinformation. But we may surely feel confident that as in 1871,† so in the sequel to the present troubles, the mass of German Catholicism will re-vindicate itself.

It must not be forgotten that one of the preponderating ingredients in the true German, the non-Prussian, character is its *Gemüthlichkeit*, its easy-going-ness, its readiness to be led. The German is perfect material for the martinet, and what is more, he renders to his masters

* Four volumes. Paris, 1911-1913. Bismarck’s flirtations with the French anti-Clericals in this connection are significant. See Vol. II., ch. vii.-x.

† See Goyau, *L’Allemagne religieuse*, Vol. IV., pp. 258-262.

German Catholics and the War

for the time being not merely an external, but an interior obedience. He absorbs. Add to this his capacity for detail and for drudgery, and his indiscriminating thoroughness, and much is explained. His masters have told him that he is called out for a defensive war; all the rest follows. They have told him shocking tales, incredible to any less docile type of mind. It is enough, he believes them. The idea that the average German Catholic has knowingly sold his soul for the principle of "Deutschland über Alles," or that he has so tampered with his Faith as to render himself incapable, if he had the facts, of a sound moral judgment of the issues of principle or of fact raised since August, 1914, is preposterous. It is incompatible alike with what we know of his character and with the facts that have reached us as to the practice of religion in Catholic Germany at the present moment. And M. Johannet's book itself bears evidence to the same effect.

The Advent Pastoral of the German Archbishops and Bishops for 1914* well illustrates what we mean. A document more completely misled as to the facts and the issues, yet one more true to Catholicism in the principles it invokes and, unknowingly, misapplies, it would be difficult to find. And their lordships' language is significant, with its references to an "anti-Christian 'super-culture,' unhealthy in its very essence," and to forces which are "seeking to exclude to the utmost the Christian spirit and Christian principles" from Germany. Still more remarkable is the later manifesto of Dr. Foerster, the famous professor of Munich, whose *Pilgrim's Progress*, from a barren secularism to an acknowledgment that in Catholicism alone can the world's problems find an adequate solution, has been so significant a chapter of modern German thought. This document †—as ill-informed as the Bishops' Pastoral

* Summarised in Gaudeau, pp. 50-51, and in *The Times*, January 21st, 1915.

† In *Die Friedenswarte für Zwischenstaatliche Organisation*, March and April, 1915.

German Catholics and the War

upon the facts—is an *ex professo* attack upon Prussian militarism, which with its principal exponents it denounces by name, as contrary to everything that both Christianity and the true German culture stand for. Of Treitschke's notorious chapter on "The State and the Moral Law" in the *Lectures on Politics*, he writes :

It is my conviction that this materialisation of the principle of force, this liberation of the State from all idea of law, has worked in a thoroughly corrupting way upon our generation.

And again :

The State which blindly cares only for the preservation of its own power and will not realize how far its true conditions of existence lie beyond those that are simply tangible, must perish from its own short-sightedness.

As for von Bernhardi, Professor Foerster expressly desires that his manifesto should be considered as a protest against the idea that this writer represents true German political thought. By such writers, he says,

the shaping and self-preservation of a united State is generally regarded as a kind of natural phenomenon which proceeds outside the realm of ethical powers and judgments. Politics are looked on as a play of masses in which the laws of dynamics are alone valid, and where it is indeed an ethical duty to sacrifice personal scruples to the dynamic necessities.

And, again :

The health of the soul is at the same time the health of society. For the ethical energy with which the State overcomes centrifugal forces is derived only from the ethical energy with which the conscience conquers human passions. . . . For religion, the great hour will first strike when heathenism vanishes from politics, when the bankruptcy of the entire doctrine of power has been recognised and when the people understand that the light of life is given to bind all the influences of time with the eternal, and to derive from the eternal truths power for the life of the State.

We have no desire to lay undue stress upon Professor Foerster's manifesto, or shut our eyes to his inclusion of

German Catholics and the War

our English political methods, very unjustly, in the same condemnation with those of the Prussians. No doubt, too, the Catholics of Munich, with only one view of the war firmly imposed on their minds and their imaginations, consider it, on the principle that *toute vérité n'est pas bonne à dire*, an extremely ill-timed pronouncement. For our purpose, however, it suffices that such a statement exists just now, whatever conditions may qualify it. It is the sign of an undercurrent of right feeling and right thinking that will one day emerge again; it is a sign of hope, a notable augury of good. Things like this, however few and far between, and however qualified, go to show that if, or rather when, the anti-Christian conspiracy of the Prussians against civilisation and justice is crushed, there may remain among the German peoples, awakened to the realities, a great healing and reconstructing force, Christian and Catholic.

The troubles and perplexities of the early seventies recur again and again to our mind as we contemplate the position of German Catholicism in the present crisis. The defections of great names, almost usurping in the world's eyes the whole stage, could not avail then to dim the Faith or quench the devotion of Catholic Germany. The heart remained sound, the mass remained uncontaminated. To-day the veil is drawn; we are allowed to hear, in the name of Catholicism, little save the voices of a few politicians of second rank, of a few amateurs in ecclesiastical politics, already something more than suspect. When authority speaks, its words in all that regards Faith and morals are what we should expect, even if its facts are as manifestly dictated from Berlin. As for the faithful in the mass, we doubt not that the touching picture is still true, which M. Bricout draws of them as they were when, after the Council of the Vatican, the world thought German Catholicism was going back upon its Faith :

Dans les paroisses, on n'allait pas chercher si loin ce qu'on devait croire ou ce qu'on devait faire. Ce peuple allemand,

German Catholics and the War

dans les diocèses de Cologne et de Westphalie surtout, allait à la messe, se confessait, communiait, suivait les dévotions qu'on lui indiquait. Ne sont-ils pas les petits avec qui le divin Maître se plaisait à vivre, et qu'il enveloppait de sa prédilection ? *

Doubtless they are sundered from us at present by a deep and terrible gulf. But as Catholics they can only form their consciences upon the material available to them through the medium of an enslaved Press, and we can neither be surprised, nor reproach them, if their action follows their information. Indeed, the better the Catholic, the more thoroughly will it do so. We can but accept the position as a terrible, yet an inevitable, concomitant of the state of war. But we need not read into it more than it means, or affix to German Catholicism in the mass the stigma certain sections of it have well deserved. Rather we may discern signs of hope, and anticipate with confidence a great and healing mission for our co-religionists of the rank and file in Germany when their opportunity comes and they may again find freedom and a voice.

We cannot conclude without a word in reference to the German soldiery of the Catholic obedience. *En masse* some sections of these have a specially bad reputation, not unsupported by converging lines of evidence. Doubtless much infection must spread into the rank and file of any army whose higher command promulgates and enforces the principles of the German War-book, and doubtless certain of the Catholic districts of Germany, within a well-defined region, have shown in peace-time a mentality very little Catholic, and only too likely to develop in time of war into untamed savagery. Such things will be ; *corruptio optimi pessima*. But we prefer to dwell on the other side of the picture. It will be for the Powers at the proper time to judge and to execute judgment on the guilty whoever they be. As Catholics, it is no less our duty than our comfort to say with regard to an enemy army as a whole—and here we adopt the

* *Revue du Clergé Français*, April 15th, 1915, p. 115.

German Catholics and the War

words of a theologian of repute belonging to an allied nation—that a soldier, whose conscience has been formed upon misinformation, so that his ignorance of the real facts and issues becomes invincible, dying upon the field of battle for the most unjust of causes, may find grace and merit before the Divine justice and mercy, just as if he were bringing to consummation the most pure of sacrifices. How well many thousands of our German co-religionists have thus died there is abundance of testimony, nor need our appreciation of their sacrifice be the less by reason of our own bounden duty in conscience to go on killing still more thousands of them till the cause of righteousness is vindicated, and the objects entrusted to our arms attained. If we may thus think of the mass of our co-religionists for the time in arms against us, there are abundant stories of individuals that may well touch and console our own hearts amidst our private sorrows for fallen friends. We have space for but one, a story told by a French trooper in *La Presse* towards the end of last year :

We had reached our position in a night march and were looking for some shelter when we saw a large farmhouse. There was a passage before us, and at the end a door. We could see a faint glow, and we heard low murmurs. Our officer dashed across the passage with us close behind, and throwing open the door entered the room. A strange sight met our eyes. We had entered a low vaulted room, lit by two flickering candles placed at either end of a long table. Kneeling round the table were five Germans, three officers, and two soldiers praying. One of the officers held a string of beads between his fingers. We shouldered our rifles and our officer called out to the Germans to surrender. . . . The officer who held the rosary explained in French that they had lost their way in a storm, and, having nothing to eat or drink, had entered the farmhouse to seek food and shelter. They had given themselves up for lost and had knelt down to say a last prayer. He asked our officer if they would be shot, and seemed much relieved when told that they would all be treated as prisoners of war.*

* Quoted in *The Month*, December, 1914, pp. 628-9.

German Catholics and the War

And if we seek an example of the spirit in which we should think of our German brethren as a whole, it is furnished us in this story from a Baden paper, of the way in which women of France—so much more sorely tried than we—have thought of them :

An exalted person has visited the tombs of our soldiers fallen in August and September, on the banks of the Oise, and found among many others two large mounds with wreaths of flowers laid upon them. The first bore the inscription : " Offered by the women of France to the German soldiers, our brothers in Jesus Christ." A second inscription read : " For the German soldiers, our brothers in Jesus, dead far away from their country, wept by their families. We pray for them."

Many times in her history has the Church suffered grievous wounds in the moral sundering of her children under the stress of war, and many have been the scandals and distresses that have afflicted her in the course of political, national, racial contentions between them. Yet always, when those wounds went no deeper, she has presently emerged with renewed strength. *Dabit Deus his quoque finem.*

A PLEA *for* NATIONALISM

The Great Settlement. By C. Ernest Fayle. Pp. xx, 310.
London, John Murray. 6s. net.

THE resurgence of the national sentiment in modern politics is a fact which the States of Europe will have to reckon with in the settlement following the war. That this international settlement must be based on the principle of nationality is the argument of the treatise whose title stands at the head of this article. Mr. Fayle, indeed, gives us a most cogent argument, based on a careful reading of history, and applied in detail to the many and difficult problems that will arise. With that argument I am in entire agreement, and I propose, while passing over the details of its application, to add some further general considerations which it seems to invite. The weak point in the book is its proposed "settlement" of colonial possessions. This properly raised the question of the right of civilized nations to take over and administer territories occupied by uncivilized peoples. Mr. Fayle avoids this question and contents himself with discussing the expediency of a "division of spoils" in view of the future peace of Europe. Yet if Europe takes upon itself to divide the spoils, it surely has a moral obligation to see that the division is made in the interests of the uncivilized peoples as well as of the nations which take them over. That, too, is a question which should enter into "The Great Settlement."

For the past half century and more national sentiment has been a disturbing factor in the international situation, challenging the world's peace and upsetting the calculations of the established Powers. For that reason the more conservative politicians and those whose interests or sympathies were bound up with the established order of things, viewed the emergence of the new nationalism into practical politics with distrust or antipathy. Many,

A Plea for Nationalism

too, who were not in principle opposed to the nationalist claims, found themselves alienated from the cause of nationalism by the methods adopted to enforce it, and by the aggressiveness, political and military, which in not a few instances has followed upon the achievement of national independence. Nor has the nationalist movement generally in the hour of its political success fulfilled its promise of a wider popular liberty. The "liberated" nation has too often cast off the domination of a foreign power only to find itself in the grip of a native political or military caste as inimical to the real liberty of the people at large as any foreign domination might be.

These charges are undeniable; but they amount to no more than this, that the nationalist movements, with perhaps one or two exceptions, have fallen under the spell of that very state-craft against which they have asserted their own liberty. The new nationalism has been but too apt a pupil in the political school which for centuries has perverted the national ideal or attempted to crush it out, as best suited the purpose of the modern State. In truth the State as it has developed during the past four centuries, has been the tragedy of the national spirit: for under the domination of a materialist statecraft nationalism degenerated into a political separatism which not only destroyed the comity of Christendom and set the peoples of Europe in armed defiance of each other, but at the same time made the people at large mere puppets of the ruling party in the State.

For these reasons nationalism has been denounced as an evil thing both on religious grounds by many who desire a Catholic unity and on economic grounds by not a few socialistic reformers. But no one can study the history of the nationalist movement in Christendom since its inception at the close of the mediæval period, and not be aware that these evils have proceeded not from nationalism itself but from the statecraft by which it has been dominated. It is the conception of the State which has been at fault and not the principle of nationalism.

A Plea for Nationalism

The nationalist ideal as it emerges into history has always been bound up with the liberty of the people, and has been essentially a pacific movement : whereas the statecraft of modern Europe from the fifteenth century until the French Revolution, and to a large extent until now, has been formed upon the principle that might is right, to the subversion of liberty, whether in the internal affairs of the State or in its foreign relations. That statecraft was not an outcome of the nationalist spirit, but was imposed upon it by those whom the circumstances of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries enabled to rise to power : and it is to this statecraft that the unhappy divisions arose which set State against State and class against class. Undoubtedly national sentiment allowed itself to be used as a lever by those who had power. The feeling for national unity which was fanned into flame in Germany during the Napoleonic wars gave Prussia the opportunity to impose its militarist spirit upon the whole German people and to bring about the formation of the German Empire ; just as at an earlier time the French feeling for national unity made it possible for Francis I. and his successors to build up the régime which was shattered at the Revolution. To that extent national sentiment must be held guilty of the crimes done in its name. It paid the ultimate penalty when at the Congress of Vienna the map of Europe was arranged with a cynical disregard of national feeling ; and the weaker nationalities were apportioned or tolerated to satisfy the ambitions of the stronger Powers.

Nevertheless, as the world has learned since to its cost, the spirit of nationalism could not be thus summarily crushed out ; just because, whatever its history may have been in the past, the nationalist sentiment is essentially a true sentiment—true, that is, to man's very nature ; nor shall we attain to any wider political system which will gain the willing allegiance of the peoples except through a frank recognition of their various national sentiments. Any international or imperial

A Plea for Nationalism

system which may be evolved to secure peace and co-operation and goodwill amongst the peoples must take into account those fundamental distinctions of character and those distinctive ideals of social life which have their ultimate basis in the human individuality itself. No political or social system can endure or have any moral authority which ignores the essential constitution of human nature itself, or takes away the rightful liberties of the human spirit: and national life is undoubtedly one of those liberties. Whatever legists and materialists may say, an ideal for which men, and the better sort of men, are prepared to sacrifice every material advantage, and even to die—which evokes, as few other things can, the noblest emotions—such an ideal must express something deeply sacred in a man's life and something in the conservation of which he is convinced that he is fulfilling the nobler purpose of his own individual existence. Ideals of this sort in the nobility of the emotions they call forth prove their truth and sacredness, and in their endurance prove their spiritual reality. To deprive a man of such ideals is to inflict upon him moral and spiritual injury and to take from him the proper freedom of his soul. A people, therefore, to whom the national ideal of life is sacred cannot part with it except to their own spiritual loss. If there is one lesson history teaches clearly and dogmatically, it is that once a national spirit is awakened it cannot be crushed out except as the people become morally and spiritually devitalised.

It follows, then, that if the political reconstruction of Europe is to be based upon a more spiritual conception of human life, it must, amongst other things, give national sentiment its due place, both in the formation of the State and in the organisation of any international system. The international community, whether governed by imperial or more universal law, must be a community of peoples established each in the possession of its own national ideal, and with a legitimate liberty to develop its own national life, and each co-operating with the other

A Plea for Nationalism

with a respect for the other's rightful liberty. Only thus can we hope for any wider community of thought and life or any international system of law which will command the willing allegiance of the peoples themselves, and not merely the adhesion of parties in power.

The moral sense of Europe has, in fact, outgrown the formula : " The State which can conquer has the right to dominate " ; nor will it any longer admit that an empire built upon the foundation of force has any moral sanction. The old statecraft may yet linger in the councils of Europe, but the peoples themselves are beginning clearly to recognise that no people have a right to exploit for their own benefit or self-glorification any other people, and that as between self-conscious nationalities co-operation is morally healthy only when each respects the rights of the other, in such a way that every nation may be at liberty to develop its own proper life and be enabled, as Mr Fayle says, " to contribute to the common stock of civilization that which is characteristic and peculiar to its institutions and outlook, that which it has derived from its own special opportunities and traditions." Yet if nationalism is to fulfil its proper function in the moral and spiritual development of the world—" to contribute to the common stock of civilisation"—it must be more clearly recognised than has generally been the case what constitutes the ultimate moral claim of a people to political sovereignty within the wider community of international law.

Now it is as a spiritual and not merely a political or geographical entity that a nation has its ultimate claim to a place in the world's life. The real bond of a nation, as distinct from the mere State, is not its material interests, but its habits of thought, its community of ideas, its common aspirations towards the realisation of some special soul—liberty in which the individuality of each member of the nation finds the widest freedom of development whilst at the same time it is conserved in its own fundamental character. In this combination of the largest liberty with the fundamental particularism which

A Plea for Nationalism

belongs to the human personality nationalism is founded. The genius of the national spirit is to bring men into touch with the universal life of the human spirit but by way of some fundamental soul-quality from which springs the distinctive character of the nation. In this particular soul-quality lies the radical unity of a national people ; in the wide liberty in which this soul-quality is conserved lies the nation's peculiar hold upon men's loyalty. National life is thus to the sincere nationalist at once the conservation of his own moral and spiritual personality and the home of its widest freedom. Outside the nation a man runs either into some lesser circle of mental and moral interests which confine the free development of mind and character, or into a cosmopolitanism without definite line or colour in which the human personality is apt to lose itself in a blur of emotions and ideas.

There is but one organic society in history which has appealed to men upon the ground of its universalism and upon that ground maintained itself in history, and that is the Catholic Church ; but then its universalism is of a "supernatural," not of the secular order. And its universalism is based on the Divine Personality of our Lord, which is above, whilst it encompasses, all those developments of the human personality which make the tale of the world's history. Yet even the Catholic Church as it actualises amongst men has had to have regard for those differences of thought and temperament which lead men to associate with this man rather than with that, for the freer and more perfect realisation of some personal ideal. In the greater religious orders and in the schools of devotional life and thought they generate, we have a type of religious life closely corresponding with the idea of nationality in secular life.

But whereas the special particular forms of Catholic life originate in and move within its manifest, accepted universal Faith and system, in secular life it is by the reverse process that men come to realise the wider thought and common life. Civilisation proceeds by enlarging the liberty of association and breaking through

A Plea for Nationalism

the narrower confines of social life with the purpose of giving to the human spirit wider conditions for the exercise of its proper freedom. Yet in each stage the test of the moral validity of the wider association lies in its effect upon the moral and spiritual character of the individual. It is by this test that all associations must be judged whose primary object is the conservation and development of human life itself.

In the present stage of the world's social development national life is undoubtedly the form of secular association which is capable of giving the fullest freedom to human thought and character and at the same time of maintaining that definiteness and colour which denotes true spiritual vitality. For that reason the development of wider political associations—if they are to march a step forward in the world's moral progress—must proceed upon the basis of national life and assume to themselves and conserve those definite moral and spiritual qualities which till now have found their largest expression in national life itself. Upon such a basis one may well contemplate the growth of imperial systems without distrust. Hitherto the conception of imperialism has been vitiated by its antagonism to the sentiment which clings to national ideals: that antagonism must give place to a confession that only by taking to itself the national ideals of the peoples and giving them a yet wider freedom can any empire claim moral authority over those to whom these ideals are sacred or escape the curse of that cosmopolitanism which devitalises a community spiritually and deprives it of character and force morally and intellectually. The recognition of national sentiment in the political system of the immediate future is therefore essential if we are to escape from the materialism of the past.

But the mere political recognition of nationality is not enough: national life must needs be kept true to its proper spiritual idealism and not again be subverted, as has been too frequently the case in the past, to a purpose destructive of the moral and spiritual character of the

A Plea for Nationalism

nation. In many of the States of Europe the immediate difficulty will be not so much to maintain the pure national ideal as to recover it out of the moral anarchy which has been wrought by the ultra-egoism of social and political life ; nor will the recovery be made except by a vast restraint of individual and party selfishness and the welding together of the better elements in the community in a determined effort to place political and social life upon a more moral basis. National renovation is at root moral renovation ; its primary condition is the establishment of the common life of the people on those principles of right and justice which are the foundation of human liberty and the moral security at once of individual and social development. Unless this liberty and development are thus secured to the people at large, nationalism can mean nothing but an empty sentiment or a rallying cry by which the people are made the tool of the ambitious agitator or of some party in the State. It is thus that the national ideal has too frequently been emptied of its invigorating influence upon the intellectual, moral and spiritual life of the people and national life in its proper significance has ceased to exist.

The first step, then, for the maintenance or recovery of a pure nationalism is to give to the people at large those rights and liberties which belong to the human personality itself. The State must be made the guardian of the rights of the whole people instead of being, as in the past, the instrument of individual and party ambitions. Only as the people of a nation are in the possession of their freedom can real national life be regained. In the first stage of a nationalist movement men live in the ideal as in the promise of the liberty to which they aspire. But once a nation has realised itself as a political entity it must fulfil its promise and prove itself the keeper of the people's rights if the national ideal is to remain a compelling, formative power in the people's life and thought. The lowest ebb of English nationalism as a moral and spiritual ideal was in the eighteenth century, when the mass of the people were enslaved to a system which

A Plea for Nationalism

destroyed their political and social liberty even as it destroyed creative intellectual power. If to-day the war has evoked a national response alive with a high moral idealism, it is due to the more human conception of the State which the reform movements of the last century have established in the mind of the people.

But, whilst it is true that the national ideal can only achieve its promise amongst a people in the possession of their legitimate rights and liberty, yet it is well to bear in mind that the mere notion of liberty, especially in the political and social significance of the word, does not exhaust the conception of nationalism. The liberty to which the sincere nationalist aspires is the liberty to live his life within the wide environment, political, social and intellectual, of his own national ideals. From these ideals his liberty gains its constructive character and its special colour of life. A Frenchman's idea of liberty is very different from an Englishman's, just because in each case the idea of liberty is invested with the ideals which belong to each nation ; and it is in the freedom of his own ideal life that the Frenchman or the Englishman attains to his full moral stature and finds the more complete expression of himself. To foster its own idealism of life is consequently an essential function of every nation.

Precisely what the special idealism is which creates the distinctive moral and spiritual character of a national people can never adequately be put into words ; it is felt and intuitively apprehended by the nation itself, just as most things which are intimately bound up with the entire personality of man are known and understood. For that reason national life manifests itself and develops instinctively and spontaneously rather than of set purpose. One can give it freedom more easily than definite laws. Hence in the fostering of reconstruction of a national idealism one has to rely upon the vital instinct and intuition of the nation rather than upon logical theories which in their very transparent clearness are frequently delusive. As we look back upon the history of nations, the main factor by which a people's idealism is

A Plea for Nationalism

conserved and fostered and renovated would seem to be that inspired personal utterance of the national spirit which is found in the martyrs and confessors of a nation's cause and in the best writers of a nation's literature. Language and customs and institutions play their part in the conservation of nationality ; but, apart from the living tradition which is uttered in the lives and thought of the more heroic sons and daughters of a nation, these things may become mere deadening influences in the national organism, mere monuments of a past that was alive. Hence for the conservation of a nation's idealism a certain national hero-worship seems necessary, as well as a constant assimilation of a nation's past thought embodied in its national literature. In other words, a people must know their own history and literature and go back upon the life and thought of its past for inspiration in the present if it is to be maintained in the ideals from which it derives its moral and spiritual vigour. This is certain, that only as they are held fast in the tradition of life and thought which has made them a nation can they take over the traditions or institutions or thought of another nation without injury to their own proper character and a weakening of their own proper idealism from which their character is derived.

There are two dangers which confront every nation in the working out of its destiny. There is, on the one hand, that excessive conservatism which clings to established custom and form, whether in thought or institutions, as though these were the ultimate expression of the national life and the final test of a nation's loyalty to itself. The result of such conservatism is to cut off a people from any real intellectual or moral intercourse with the life beyond their own confines and to create a national temper narrow in its sympathies towards other peoples and in its own self-complacency. Something of this temper is perhaps manifested in the "insularity" of the average Briton, who looks upon all foreigners as specially unfortunate in their ignorance of British ways and customs ; yet more unpleasantly has it appeared in

A Plea for Nationalism

the ultra-egoism of modern German nationalism. On the other hand, there is the danger which besets nations when the national vitality is at a low ebb, and at certain transitional periods in national history, of taking over institutions and modes of thought which are alien to the genius of the nation itself. The alien elements will in time be expelled as the nation recovers its vitality ; meanwhile, however, they tend to divide a people against itself and to turn aside the proper current of national life. Thus the enthusiasm for German critical thought which infected English theological and philosophic speculation during the latter part of the last century undoubtedly gave to English speculative thought a direction out of keeping with the healthier and more practical instinct of the English mind. The same danger is not wanting in the cult of certain foreign literatures which has grown up in recent years. In our social life a pervasive cosmopolitanism has gone far towards blotting out those characteristic national traits and customs which for long gave a distinct poetry of its own to English social life. This denationalising of a people's thought and life always tends to destroy the distinctive moral fibre of a nation. Its immediate results are commonly an anarchic individualism and a morbid depression of spirit which seeks artificial stimulant in an unhealthy sensational excitement.

Undoubtedly no nation which would maintain itself in intellectual and spiritual vigour can afford to shut itself off from the life of the outer world. Intercommunication of thought and actual life is as necessary between peoples as it is between individuals if men are to avoid the fate of the hermit-kingdom. No one can look back upon English history and fail to recognise that one of the sources of our national strength has been the constant assimilation by English thought and life of vital elements in the civilisation of other peoples. But this constant borrowing has made for national strength just because of the persistence of the essential idealism of the Anglo-Saxon race in the structure of the nation. It is that which makes the England of to-day historically and spiritually one with the

A Plea for Nationalism

England over which Alfred ruled, in spite of all that has happened to modify or enlarge the boundaries of national life.

Any true development of a nation must, then, be fostered in that fundamental idealism which has drawn a people together, and makes them a distinct intellectual and moral unit in the general structure of the world's civilisation. Thus, for instance, to deprive an Englishman of that ideal of personal liberty which has been the main factor in the evolution of English nationality would cut at the root of all that has been for ages the secret of his moral vigour and proper character. Liberty to him is not merely a question of the form of government under which he lives : it is the far deeper question of his personal being in his government of himself and in his relations with other men. He would feel himself less the man he would be if he parted with it. An attempt to organise our national life upon lines outside the governance of this ideal would consequently only end in disaster to the character of the nation. What England really needs to-day is that her people should recognise clearly the moral responsibility which goes with the possession of the personal liberty they cherish. They need to be convinced that the liberty to be proud of, is the free doing of the right thing, not of the selfish thing ; that the less restriction there is upon personal liberty the greater is the responsibility which falls to each man personally to work for his own and the common welfare. With this recovery of its moral character we may well trust to the individualism of the English nation to work out its salvation in the new conditions of political and social life which are before us. And as with England, so with every nation : the immediate need is that the people should recognise the duties which national ideals and national existence impose upon them. They must be made to feel, above all else, that the moral and spiritual idealism which is the real source of a nation's endurance and its ultimate claim to existence is a sacred trust not to be bartered away in an insensate greed for material wealth or political dominance.

A Plea for Nationalism

which, sooner or later, will always react to the injury of the character and vitality of the nation itself. It is only as the nationalist spirit keeps hold of the truth that its strength lies in its moral and spiritual ideals, and not in the lust of wealth or political predominance, that it can fulfil its proper part in the civilisation of the world or maintain itself against the disintegrating force of a brutal materialism.

What the loss of its spiritual idealism means to a nation has been but too well exemplified in English national life during the past century. Whether in town or village the prevalent note had become a deep underlying pessimism. There was but little of the real joy in life, and a constantly growing hunger for artificial excitement which follows upon spiritual depression. The mass of the people, to escape from the drab monotony which enveloped their work-a-day life, were driven to the unhealthy stimulant of a sensational music-hall or picture-palace or to the rush of the week-end excursion. Our literature, too, was largely dominated by the same pessimism which had infected our social life. I speak as of the past, because with the war there has come a certain soul-awakening which may be the beginning of better things and bring to fruition the attempts made here and there to give back to the people a more healthful joy in life. These attempts have hitherto failed just because the soul of the people was deadened to the beauty which is latent in an ordinary work-a-day life by the materialist teaching with which they had been for long inoculated. All but confirmed optimists have been disheartened when they attempted to revive the former social life of the village. Town pageants and civic and empire processions have left a feeling of unreality behind them so far as the common sentiment of the populace was concerned : they were a break in the monotony of life and little, if anything, more. The truth is, you cannot superimpose real pleasure in life upon a people to whom the common daily round means only a struggle for existence or for the accumulation of bodily comfort or for sense-enjoyment. Until their work-a-day life itself becomes

A Plea for Nationalism

transfused with the idealism of duty willingly accepted and of spiritual aspiration, there is lacking the very capacity for real enjoyment, and pleasure becomes mainly the art of forgetting.

But with the recovery of our national idealism the nation may again find a natural enjoyment in life and invest itself once more with that poetic and artistic colour which comes insensibly to a people spiritually alive and vitally hopeful amidst the labours of the day. The more general awakening of the conscience of the nation to the moral and spiritual values of life which the war has occasioned is indeed the opportunity for a new and wider effort to get rid of the drab utilitarianism which has so long befogged the people's mental vision and deprived our national habits and institutions of that poetic glamour which helps so much to keep a nation's soul alive, for you cannot take from a people the poetic colour of life without debasing life itself. What, then, we ask of the revived nationalist spirit is that it be true to its spiritual origin and nobler ideals and that it cast off the base tradition which for centuries has perverted it to the destruction at once of the real liberty of the people and of the comity of nations, that it turn from the materialist policies of the past and look more consistently to the moral and spiritual life which is latent in all human nature and separates the man from the brute. Only thus will the new nationalism make for peace amongst the peoples and for a higher moral standard in political and social life.

The great danger which confronts the national spirit to-day is the same as that to which it has succumbed during the past four centuries : that danger is the worship of the State as the symbol of political predominance and national pride. It is the rock upon which national liberties and national idealism have hitherto too frequently been shipwrecked. The nation with its human emotions and its moral and spiritual ideals—the living organic community—and not the impersonal State, is the true glory of a national people. In the worship of the State fostered since the fifteenth century nationalism lost much

A Plea for Nationalism

of its spiritual character : the people were led to betray their own freedom for the illusion of national predominance or material wealth ; they sacrificed the right of individual conscience in national affairs on the altar of a State authority which defied the common laws of individual morality. And so it will be again unless the nationalist spirit, taught by the experience of the past, keeps a faster hold upon the moral and spiritual ideals from which it has sprung. In so far as it is true to its spiritual character it will justify itself against the political systems of the past.

FR CUTHBERT, O.S.F.C.

ART AFTER THE WAR

AMONG the many hopes that are to be realized through the present clash of arms is that of a new birth to art in all its forms. As in the political life of the nations, so also in the artistic, a great flux is taking place. The tendencies are manifold, nor does anybody know for certain whither this or that is leading. Yet there is a general feeling that the evil will fall away whilst the good will evolve into maturity. The students of politics and the social order are already busy with plans for reconstruction when the day of peace shall have arrived. And a similar activity must be shown by the masters in art if they are to save their precious heritage.

The purpose of the following essay is to suggest at least one leading principle, the acknowledgement and application of which is to help in the discrimination of the chaotic elements. It will indeed be a sort of selective principle in the genesis of the new spirit of beauty.

The principle is this, that all art is sacramental. There is an outward sign and an inward beauty. Let both live together, and they will be fruitful. Divorce them, and they both become barren.

Perhaps the question may be more clearly stated with reference to the sphere of music. There, at any rate, the problem is felt more acutely. In the sister art of poetry ideas are expressed by conventional signs which we call words. But in music the ideas must be expressed by natural signs, by signs composed of sounds indicating in a natural way, more or less distinctly, the thought to be expressed. Consequently the language of music is generally less intelligible than the language of poetry. Hence the acute controversy between musical æsthetes.

Walter Pater, in his essay on "The School of Giorgione" points out that, whilst each art has its own peculiar sensuous charm and its own special mode of reaching the imagination, yet each may be observed to pass into the condition of some other art. There is a kind of overflow from one art to another. No art can be an

Art after the War

adequate substitute for another, but it may lend to it new forces. A poem and a picture may serve to illustrate and amplify each other. A drama or a symphony may lend to each other additional strength and clarity.

This is only another way of saying that a man has five senses, and that he normally uses them in harmony with each other. He hears a theme being worked out in musical composition and he tries to make a pictorial representation of it. Where one sense is wanting in definition another sense seeks spontaneously to supply the defect. A man sees the hard limitation of pure form in sculpture and seeks to supply the natural complement of colour.

And because the language of music is so natural, so near akin to the thoughts which are expressed, the distinction between the matter and form of music is less apparent than in the other arts. The distinction between the ideas in a poem and the artistic form of a poem is very clear. So also the distinction between the subject of a picture and the spirit of its treatment. But it is the aim of art to conceal this distinction. *Ars est celare artem*. And the concealment is most completely accomplished in the art of music. Hence Pater derives the startling conclusion that "all art constantly aspires towards the condition of music." All the other arts tend to overflow their limitations and to flow in the direction of music.

"It is the art of music," he writes, "which most completely realizes this artistic ideal, this perfect identification of form and matter. In its ideal consummate moments, the end is not distinct from the means, the form from the matter, the subject from the expression, they inhere in and completely saturate each other, and to it, therefore, to the condition of its perfect moments, all the arts may be supposed constantly to tend and aspire. Music, then, and not poetry, as is so often supposed, is the true type or measure of perfected art."*

Out of this very quality and perfection of the art arises the controversy as to the merits respectively of concrete and abstract music.

* *The Renaissance*, p. 144.

Art after the War

It is true that the evolution of music, let us say from Palestrina to Beethoven, has been an evolution from the more concrete to the more abstract. It is true also that in the evolution of the work of individual masters there has been an evolution from the concrete to the abstract. But always, everywhere and by every one up to the time of Beethoven the need was felt for the two elements, the concrete and the abstract. Beethoven stands at the crossways. He had found the due equipoise between the concrete and the abstract, for whilst he chose such concrete themes as Napoleon for the "Eroica" symphony, and Floretan and Fidelio for the "Leonora No. 3" overture, it was always the inner impressions which he wished to produce, and always through the medium of a definite and intelligent scheme of design.

If we take Beethoven as having made the due equipoise, then we must take Brahms as the composer, who exaggerated everything in the direction of the abstract. Sir Edward Elgar, in his lectures at the Birmingham University, claimed that the Third Symphony of Brahms was the very height of musical art, because of the absence from it of any pictorial or literary idea. It was, he said, simply a piece of music which called up a certain set of emotions in each individual hearer. That, to his mind, was the height of music. When music was simply a description of something else it was carrying a large art somewhat further than he cared for. He thought music, as a simple art, was at its best when it was simple, as in this case. He protested against people when they heard a Beethoven symphony, calling up all sorts of pictures, which might or might not have existed in the composer's mind.

In contrast to Brahms there is Strauss. He exaggerates in the direction of the concrete. Hitherto the Kaiser, affecting to be a purist, strongly disapproved of him. But lately, being in need of something pictorial and spectacular for the people, he commands Richard Strauss. A grand march is wanted. It must begin with mourning and lamentation and end with triumph and victory. It is just

Art after the War

the theme for the composer of the Domestic Symphony. The rattle of the sabre can be musically reproduced even as the rattle of cups and saucers.

Nevertheless the artist in music finds out that he cannot afford either to minimize or abolish either the matter or the form in his art. See, for instance, how Elgar, in spite of his conviction about the Brahms symphony, habitually calls in the use of the pictorial. "Cockaigne" and "In the South" are but series of small musical descriptions. The "Enigma Variations" is a collection of musical portraits, the score of which is dedicated "To my friends pictured within." The "Froissart" overture is a picture taken from a speech of Claverhouse in "Old Mortality." The prelude to "Gerontius" and the introduction to the Second Part of "The Apostles," are musical pictures of what is to be afterwards told in literature and music combined.

Amongst the rest of the moderns the defect created by the divorce of matter from form is supplied in various ways, and with very varying degrees of success and failure.

Before proceeding to enlarge on the foregoing statement let me say precisely what I mean by the word form.

The common charge brought by the academic party against the moderns is that their music is formless. The moderns reply by asking for a definition of form. Then the opposing parties discover that they each have a different notion as to what form consists in, or that modern music does possess some kind of form.

Hitherto form was understood to be that relationship between the parts of a piece which made them one complete whole. Now obviously all the works of Debussy have perfect form according to this definition. Yet the works of Debussy are classed as formless by the academics, or are set aside as vague and meaningless. Clearly then another element is wanted in the definition. What the traditional composers really meant by form was that *intellectual* relationship between the parts of a piece which made them one complete whole. In this sense Debussy may be said to be vague and almost formless. But then he

Art after the War

has another bond of unity which gives all his pieces the character of completeness and unity. This is what is known as atmosphere or colour or feeling. So surely is it a matter of course that no one who is not possessed of a deep and sensitive feeling ought ever to attempt to play Debussy's music. A very high degree of technique is also required, but mere technique is useless.

Further, the executant who will play Debussy must utilize the sacramental principle. If he merely tries to imitate the lines of "The Sunken Cathedral" or the play of "The Wind upon the Plain" he will fail miserably. These outward signs must signify some inward beauty which must be reproduced through the outward signs. Nay, the Prelude *L'après-midi d'un faune* may be taken to summarize all the beauty and all the defect of Debussy's writing. It enkindles the feelings and the imagination, leaving room for the generation of untold inward beauty not thought of by the composer. Yet its vagueness blurs the lines of beauty. Colour is not an adequate substitute for line.

Definite line is indeed more or less needful for the expression of colour. Matter cannot be intelligently manipulated without form. And the neglect of this truth has made possible the position of such a charlatan as Schönberg. The only form he possesses is the vague meandering of his own impulses. The only matter he possesses is the discord of sounds thrown together anyhow. If there is any method in the madness it is the method of deliberately repeating a peculiarly disagreeable interval or combination. When one continually hears something which is unexpected and at the same time disagreeable one can grant that there is some sort of idiom present. But it is an idiom confined to the one composer. When in ordinary life a man speaks an idiom peculiar to himself, understood only by himself, we say that he is in need of treatment.

Of course there is a definite relationship between any one sound and any other. But that is not the point. The point is whether such relationship is perceived by the

Art after the War

mind of the composer or his hearers. The essential difference between Debussy and Schönberg is that in the one the relationship is at least implicitly perceptible, whilst in the other it is not. Hence Debussy has a beautiful method of expressing his graceful thoughts, whereas Schönberg has nothing worth saying, and only hideous noises with which to say it.

Clearly then the first principle which needs recognition in the controversy between programme and absolute music, between the academic and the modern, is the principle of sacramentality. We seek for a due equipoise between the spirit and the letter, between the inward grace (or beauty) and the outward sign, between the matter and the form. When we have found this then we shall have a rational and artistic basis from which to set out in the quest of new tonalities, new forms, new colours, new graces.

The same principle, too, will enable us the better to understand the relationship between the different arts. The yearning of one art for another (*anders-streben*), the tendency of an art to reach beyond its own limitations, the power of an art to illustrate another, all this is explained by the sacramental principle. A man's spirit is one whilst his senses are five. A spiritual beauty is capable of indefinite expression. Love, courage, pathos, and tragedy can be uttered in literature, painting, sculpture or music. According to the capabilities of the artist, he will choose his own proper medium, but his idea or emotion will be apt for indefinite illustration through the medium of the other arts.

Poetry, considered as the silent written word, tends first and chiefly towards the art of painting. As the reader ponders over the poetic description he forms an image in his mind, but this image is capable of more definite delineation through the aid of the pictorial art. The poem creates an inward beauty in the soul, but the external sign of the written word is not adequate to it. The supplementary sign of a picture is wanted for a due equipoise.

Art after the War

Let us take as an instance the following passage from the *Vita Nuova* of Dante:

Then Love said "Now shall all things be made clear,
Come and behold our Lady where she lies."

These 'wilderling fantasies.

Then carried me to see my Lady dead,
Even as I there was led.

Her ladies with a veil were covering her;
And with her was such very humbleness,
That she appeared to say "I am at peace."

This was Dante's poetic narration of the dream which he had on the day of Beatrice's death. There is full and clear line in it. It succeeds as only such a great poet could succeed, in exciting a deep emotion and spiritual conception. The reader may read the lines again and again, deriving a clearer expression and making a deeper impression each time. Still there is an exigency for the pictorial art.

In this case the picture has been provided by Rossetti. It represents a chamber of dreams, where Beatrice is lying on a couch, having just passed from life to death. Love appears as an angel leading Dante by the hand. Dante is still asleep and dreaming and Love is pointing an arrow and an apple-blossom at his heart. As they come to the recess of the couch Love stoops to give Beatrice a kiss, Dante having never done this in her lifetime. Two women, clothed in green, hold a pall filled with may-blossoms ready to cover the face of the dead. On the sides of the recess two staircases lead out of the chamber, in each of which a bird is seen flying, an emblem of love. Thus an abundance of detail is supplied by the painter's art, notwithstanding the fact that the art of the poet was so expressive.

More significant still is Rossetti's own poem, "The Blessed Damozel." It has the honour of having been twice illustrated by Rossetti himself, and once by Burne-Jones. The conception is one that finds a sympathy in every human heart. Two lovers have been separated by death.

Art after the War

They look forward to that eternity, when they shall be reunited never to part again. Although faith teaches that in heaven there are no regrets, no yearnings, no unsatisfied desires, yet the same faith teaches that the blessed have a vivid appreciation of the regrets, yearnings, and unsatisfied desires of their friends on earth. This is the main spiritual truth which Rossetti visualized in his poem:

The blessed damozel leaned out
From the gold bar of heaven;
Her eyes were deeper than the depth
Of water stilled at even;
She had three lilies in her hand,
And the stars in her hair were seven.

In his first picture Rossetti emphasizes the sure hope of reunion by painting groups of lovers in the background, happy in their perfect embrace.

Around her, lovers, newly met,
'Mid deathless love's acclaims,
Spoke evermore among themselves
Their heart remembered names.
And the souls mounting up to God
Went by her like thin flames.

Yet, although he did insist upon the joy of reunion, he seems to have been more affected by the pain of longing and waiting. Hence, in his second version he omits the groups of lovers, and the yearning look in the eyes of the Blessed Damozel is accentuated. He had been impressed with the poem of Edgar Poe, "The Raven." "I saw," he said, "that Poe had done the utmost it was possible to do with the grief of the lover on earth, and I determined to reverse the conditions and give utterance to the yearning of the loved one in heaven."

Burne-Jones is occupied almost entirely with this aspect of the truth. The figure of the Blessed Damozel is given alone and, unlike Rossetti's, in full stature as described in the poem.

Art after the War

Her robe, ungirt from clasp to hem,
No wrought flowers did adorn,
But a white rose of Mary's gift,
For service meetly worn.
Her hair that lay along her back,
Was yellow like ripe corn.

He realizes more intensely, too, the human and earthly element of the poem. The sense of depth and distance is more fully obtained in illustration of the lines:

Beneath the tides of day and night,
With flame and darkness ridge
The void, as low as where this earth
Spins like a fretful midge.

The fact that both artists only partially portray the truth hidden behind the poem is only a proof that the poem is fully informed with the sacramental principle.

But, again, poetry may be considered as a spoken word. You must read "The Blessed Damsel" aloud if you want to catch the beauty of Rossetti's quaint and even archaic phraseology. It is in poetry taken as a spoken word that you feel the overflowing tendency towards music. And very happily we have this very poem of Rossetti's translated into music by no less an artist than Debussy. There was a time when operas and songs were written wherein the music had no relationship whatever to the accompanying words. But now the music is made even something more than a suitable accompaniment. By due observance of the sacramental principle music tends of itself to express the inward beauty which is also expressed in poetry and painting. Doubtless the effort has frequently been carried beyond its proper limits, so that decadents are found, who out of sheer perversity want to make you see with your ears and hear with your eyes.

Debussy, however, being a true artist, is not to be numbered amongst such. His musical version of "The Blessed Damsel" strikes the due equipoise between the earthly and the heavenly elements even better than the

Art after the War

paintings of Rossetti and Burne-Jones. True, he has the words of the poem to guide him from phrase to phrase. Nevertheless he takes liberty with them and makes only a selection. Moreover he enters into the pre-Raphaelite spirit, and, quite contrary to his later works, he produces a tone-picture of minute detail. The melodic theme with which he opens finds him in one of his most characteristic moods, giving the hearer a feeling of distant mystery. After an orchestral prelude the words of the poem are taken up by a chorus of sopranos, who, in the most ethereal and limpid tones, describe the appearance of the Blessed Damozel as she comes to the gold bar of heaven. Then the story is resumed by a narrator and a chorus respectively. Especially wonderful is the musical portrayal of the flight of the heavenly hosts, the vast number of the elect.

The light thrilled towards her, fill'd
With angels in strong level flight.
Her eyes prayed, and she smiled.

But soon their path
Was vague in distant spheres.

Having risen to celestial heights in giving the hopes of the Damozel when her lover shall join her ("All this is when he comes") the composer falls back towards his cadence with the same sad melody with which he began. The Blessed Damozel is distraught with two emotions, hope quickened and hope deferred.

And then she cast her arms along the golden barriers,
And laid her face between her hands and wept.

Debussy does not include the words of the lover, as the piece is only for female voices and orchestra. He suggests them, however, in a short finale, when the chorus sings one sad exclamation, "Ah!"

Naturally, it would be the musician who would first feel the affinity of music to poetry. But we also have the

Art after the War

poet alive to the relationship. Francis Thompson, in his essay on Shelley, thus speaks of the shorter poems and lyrics:

"Here we have that absolute virgin-gold of song which is the scarcest among human products, and for which we can go to but three poets — Coleridge, Shelley, Chopin, and perhaps we should add Keats — 'Christabel' and 'Kubla-Khan'; 'The Skylark,' 'The Cloud' and 'The Sensitive Plant' (in its first two parts); 'The Eve of St Agnes,' and 'The Nightingale,' certain of the Nocturnes; these things make very quintessentialized loveliness. It is the attar of poetry. . . . On the marvellous music of Shelley's verse we need not dwell, except to note that he avoids that metronomic beat of rhythm which Edgar Poe introduced into modern lyric measures. . . . He could write an anapæst that would send Mr Swinburne into strong shudders (e.g. 'stream did glide') when he instinctively felt that by so foregoing the more obvious music of melody he would better secure the higher music of harmony."*

Then of late there has been an art development taking place in which music is illustrated by painting. It was, I think, the artist Pamela Colman-Smith who first exhibited pictures painted direct from music.

Long ago the principle of sacramentality unconsciously made itself felt in this sphere. Again we may quote Walter Pater in his observation of the work of Giorgione. "It is to the law or condition of music, as I said, that all art like this is really aspiring, and, in the school of Giorgione, the perfect moments of music itself, the making or hearing of music, song or its accompaniment, are themselves prominent, as subjects. On that background of the silence of Venice, which the visitor there finds so impressive, the world of Italian music was then forming. In choice of subject as in all besides, the *Concert* of the Pitti Palace is typical of all that Giorgione, himself an admirable musician, touched with his influence."†

* *Shelley*. By Francis Thompson, pp. 65-7.

† *The Renaissance*, p. 157.

Art after the War

So, too, Whistler doubtless chose "nocturnes" from the musical form. The characteristic effects of night-light were closely associated with the serenade and its more developed form in which the emotions of love and tenderness are represented.

The more modern artist, however, of whom I speak, paints directly from the live music. She may or may not know the title. She may be quite unfamiliar with the piece itself. Still if the piece is a definite unity the first few chords or the announcement of the theme will awaken a corresponding emotion which will give rise to an idea. The artist's brush is ready, and in a moment the idea begins to be realized on paper. And it is remarkable how very frequently the subject matter of the painting coincides with that of the music.

The mere knowledge of the title of a piece could not account for the striking similarities. Take for instance Debussy's "Sunken Cathedral." The title itself could never have furnished material enough for such a faithful pictorial representation of it as is seen in Miss Colman-Smith's masterpiece. "The water is profoundly deep. At first no form or outline is visible, as down and down, deeper and deeper you sink, without a ripple or a bubble to mark your descent. The watery green medium becomes opalescent and is troubled. A little light grows, and very far away comes the sound of a formal Tone, but heard only for a moment. In front of you the cloudiness of the water is being rolled up, as if by a wind of the underwater world. It ripples, it flows, it rushes, whilst bells peal distantly through it. Vaguely a form appears. The bells peal louder. Then the Sunken Cathedral in its Close of green weed is outlined clearly, the huge arches and the waving pinnacles. The Tone is heard again. But the pulsing of the sound gives way to a movement of the water, in which the image once more grows vague and indistinct. The Cathedral remains almost till the end, when the opalescence and shimmering of the water turns to opacity, and the green coolness again supervenes, while one tall strand

Art after the War

of weed occupies the place where once the Cathedral was seen.”*

Yet in much of this artist's work there is to be noticed that one chief defect which is so evident in the musicians whom she loves best to portray. This is the absence or obscurity of the theme which is to be the foundation of design. Both the music and the painting do suggest some distant mystery. But too much is left to be filled in by the hearer or the onlooker. I do not for a moment suggest that the artist should do all the thinking for his audience. On the contrary, I hold that he should stimulate them to think. But in order to do this he must provide them with real matter for thought.

To illustrate clearly what I mean we may take three tone-pictures all having the same theme: M. Ravel's "Jeux d'eau," M. Debussy's "Reflets dans l'eau," and the Abbé Liszt's "Jeux d'eau à la villa d'Este." No one can say of Ravel's work that it is a mere imitation of the play of water-spouts. It is a poetic and highly artistic tone-picture exciting similar emotions which an artist or poet might feel on contemplating the play of ornamental fountains in some beautiful garden. But the soul of the hearer, whilst delighted for the time being, never gets higher than sense and emotion. The same also may be said of M. Debussy's "Reflets dans l'eau." It is a sheer delight—to the emotions and the senses. And those who hold that this is the end of music had better keep to the impressionist artists. On the other hand the opening phrases of the work of the Abbé Liszt are merely descriptive. But then just after the materialistic description there appears a sublime motive, intensely spiritual in its nature, a motive which is intended to utter the spiritual truth embodied in the words of St John's Gospel: "But the water that I will give him, shall become in him a fountain of water, springing up into life everlasting." True, the words are given as a prefix to the work. But then the idea is there, and is expressed by the

* From the forthcoming volume of Miss P. Colman-Smith, *Music Drawings*, with Notes by Rowland Thurnam.

Art after the War

music. The sacramental principle is realized in a fair equipoise of matter and form, of expression and design, of spiritual truth and its material utterance.

The art, however, in which the greatest transformation is taking place is the art of the dance. The Russians are responsible for it, especially their great genius Nijinsky. And the transformation is due almost entirely to a recognition of the sacramental principle. Nijinsky has proved to the world that the dance is not merely a rhythmical series of pirouettings, leaps, and steppings on tip-toe. He has shown that it is the revelation of immaterial beauty through the medium of the material body.

It is pathetic to think of what the word "ballet" stood for before the Russian revival. So bad are the associations of the word that I was almost afraid to introduce the subject into this article. Yet after all the dance was distinctly religious in its original significance. It was invariably associated with religious mysteries. "And David danced with all his might before the Lord." And why? Because the body is directly informed with the soul and is the immediate and most natural organ for the expression of the soul's activity.

Now, although the Russians have not taken us back to those days when dancing was a formal religious rite, yet they have brought us back to the principle which underlay the religious rites. And in doing so they have provided us with an art which has succeeded beyond all other arts in realizing the aspirations of the modern æsthetic consciousness. Modernity has cried aloud for an emphasis of the dynamic as opposed to the static element in art. Modernity has cried aloud for an emphasis of the individual and personal element in art as opposed to the general and conventional. Nijinsky strikes the true equipoise. He takes Debussy's music *L'après-midi d'un faune*, for instance, and simply fulfils it. He supplies the definite line of form and the foundation sense of stability. For throughout the dance, except at the end, Nijinsky does not rise from his feet once. The idea has been banished for ever that dancing is the same thing as

Art after the War

sauterie. It is a rhythmical movement of the body expressive of the rhythm of the soul. The leap or the step *may* enter into this movement. In this particular dance-poem Nijinsky, at the very end, has just one agile leap. A French critic, M. Charles Meryel, shall sum up the art of the Russian dance-poet. "We should not begin by praising him for his prodigious physical ability for leaving the ground. Let us think first of his power of evoking, through the means of the human body in movement, a sort of beautiful dream, of his power of subjugating his material appearance so that he becomes a *visitation divine* and almost immaterial."

So this is the hope of the future of art, a reawakening to the respective claims of both body and spirit, a sincere endeavour to attain to an equipoise of their activities. And of course all this implies a complete repudiation of what has passed for advanced thought in Germany during the thirty years' development of the Prussian war machine. It implies a repudiation both of the materialistic monism of Haeckel and of the spiritual monism of Eucken; for the one ignores the very source of beauty, which is the world of spirit, whilst the other at least under-values and confuses, if he does not ignore, the function of the body as the organ of the spirit. Above all it implies a repudiation of the doctrine of Nietzsche, a doctrine which is answerable for nearly all the degenerate art of Europe to-day, the doctrine that sheer animal impulse is the right norm of human action. The problem is not one of mere brain or nerve modification, but one which imperatively demands a recognition of a spiritual cosmos transcending the whole material cosmos, however complexly organized it may be.

We turn then to the imaginative peoples, the Russians and the French, whose consciousness has ever been permeated by the sacramental principle inherent in their respective religions. We recall the names Tschaikowsky, Borodin, Skriabin, Rimsky-Korsakoff, Glasonoff, Liadoff, and Stravinsky; Benois and Bakst; Fokine and Nijinsky; César Franck (Belgium), Saint-Saens, Debussy, Ravel,

Art after the War

Charpentier, d'Indy, Roussel, Duparc and Dukas; Rodin and Corot; Bazin, Barrés and Claudel. Here is sample of the material whence the new form shall arise.

And what shall the contribution of the English be? Before we can say we must wait until the sacramental principle has entered more deeply into their consciousness. We have already seen the futility of an appeal to mere patriotism. We cannot stimulate interest in a branch of art merely because it is British. Something more universal is wanted, namely a general principle which is applicable to the individual nations, none other than the principle of sacramentality. The experience of the battlefields of Belgium and France will carry with it a far-reaching influence. The sight of the crucifix, attendance at the churches, the work of the priests and nuns, the pastorals of Cardinal Mercier, the bombardment of Rheims and Louvain: these things have already made a great impression on the British nation. The enormous sacrifice of life, a personal loss to so many individuals, this is helping tremendously to make us appreciate more fully the reality of the spirit world. All these influences, however, will be received according to the condition of the recipient, that is, they will fall on our national character and temperament, and there shall rise again a national art worthy of a great nation.

THOMAS J. GERRARD

ARISTOCRACY

A Defence of Aristocracy, by Anthony M. Ludovici. Constable and Co., Ltd. 1915.

MR. LUDOVICI has written an interesting book upon a great subject, but it shows signs of having been written too quickly, and without that long cogitation which gives durable life to books on similar topics, like those of Taine, or de Tocqueville, or Henry Maine. This is, it seems, the fourth book which Mr. Ludovici has published in five years. An expert can turn out decent, or, still more easily, indecent, novels at this pace, but the time really is insufficient for work requiring much thought. Over haste to appear is a besetting temptation in this age of fierce competition, when every writer is afraid lest another should anticipate his theme. Marks of haste appear in the arrangement, and even in the wording of the present book. For a defender of aristocracy, one must also regretfully say, the taste is by no means always aristocratic, Mr. Ludovici uses expressions which he would probably have discarded, had he given himself more time for careful revision, when his blood was cooler. He disagrees with Macaulay's views of history, and has a perfect right to do so, but this is no reason why he should call that great writer "stupid," and "old ass" and "fool." Mr. Ludovici should study the admirable manner of French controversial writers.

Again, Mr. Ludovici differs from Thomas Carlyle in his estimate of Oliver Cromwell. Carlyle thought Cromwell a true-born king of men, sincere, and seeing deep into the real nature of things. Mr. Ludovici thinks Cromwell an ugly beast in body and mind, canting and hypocritical, and with shocking bad taste both in the fine arts and in the art of living. Oliver Cromwell is one of the unsolved enigmas of history, and wide differences of opinion are natural and justifiable, but this divergence is no reason why Mr. Ludovici should

Aristocracy

call Carlyle an "eunuch." The violence of Mr. Ludovici's language is derived, perhaps, from two writers whom he closely follows, William Cobbett and Nietzsche. Cobbett was a self-made writer, all of a piece, who looked at history in his own direct way, and not through academic spectacles, and thus saw things much otherwise than as the English public, guided by Whig historians and essayists, had made up its mind that they were. These discoveries, as of a man who had found out a systematic fraud, working on a choleric temperament, produced the delightful outbursts in the *Rural Rides* and in the too little read *History of the Protestant Reformation*, from which Disraeli, in his novels, without any acknowledgment, freely borrowed ideas and even phrases. But what in Cobbett sounds natural, and, therefore, in its way pleasing, does in Mr. Ludovici produce on the present writer, who may, of course, err, the effect of assumed or imitated attitude. Mr. Ludovici would have done better to take as his model the polished style of Disraeli, whom he equally and justly admires.

Besides this question of style and taste, it must be added that Mr. Ludovici's judgments and summaries of history are much too absolute and sweeping, and need large qualifications. It is ludicrously false, for instance, to call St. Paul the "great apostle of anarchy and revolt"—St. Paul who preached obedience to constituted powers, even under Nero, and to ascribe the foundation of "amateurism" in politics to the same Apostle, who worked so strongly on the foundations of an ordered Church which has rested upon them for near two thousand years. Mr. Ludovici, as a disciple, more or less, of Nietzsche, may, perhaps, while that influence lasts, resent the teaching of an Apostle who preaches, as the fruits of the spirit, charity, joy, peace, patience, long-suffering, goodness, benignity, courtesy, faith, modesty, continence, chastity. Are not all these, according to our author's Master, the slave-morality of the herd? But the blemishes in Mr. Ludovici's work are the faults

Aristocracy

of haste, and, perhaps, of youth. A reviewer is bound by conscience to make such criticisms, always reluctantly, and in this case the more so since the author has during the present war been on active military service in the cause of our country. And now as to the subject of the book.

Mr. Gladstone once assured the delighted Ruskin that he himself was "an out-and-out inequalitarian." The doctrine of the intellectual and moral inequality of men is a sound central principle held by all the wisest in the ancient, mediæval, and eastern world of thought and practice. The doctrine of Rousseau was a passing heresy, soon washed out in blood and militarism, nor is it now denied that some men are endowed with special gifts for rule, whereas others, who may have great faculties in other directions, are without these. How far these gifts are hereditary and depend, like the instincts of animals, upon transmission of race-habits, is another question. The practical question is how to discover and train men with the inborn capacity, how to place and keep them in the possession of power. In the Catholic Church the attempt is made to discover men with the natural "vocation," itself possibly sometimes the fruit of heredity, as the history of some families, like the Arnaulds and the Vaughans, seems to indicate, and then to train them for office. Heredity in the direct sense is here absent, though in the ancient dispensation it was everything; for the priesthood among the Jews, as now among the Hindus, was limited to a sacred tribe. In the secular world aristocratic government has hitherto been based upon hereditary castes, more or less open to reinforcement by suitable new entrant families. These castes seem to have been originally based either upon conquest of a less by a more efficient race, or upon priority of occupation of land, or upon a blend of both origins.

What, then, is the aristocratic type of government? It is the system under which, both in national and local affairs, the chief administrative posts are usually held by

Aristocracy

men born from, and allied with, families which for some generations have held a certain established position. Such families need not possess titles of honour. All gentlemen are, in one sense, equal. As an old writer says, "the two titles of nobility and gentry are of equal esteem in the use of heraldry, though custom hath divided them, and applied the first to gentry of the highest degree, and the latter to nobles of the lowest rank." In England certainly many a squire is of more ancient established rank than many an earl or viscount, and often the real head of a family is of lower title than the chiefs of cadet branches. "Je suis ni roi ni duc aussi ; je suis le sire de Coucy," was the motto of a great French family.

Under this system young men born in such families have advantage over others in early entrance to the political career, and rapid advance in it. Since these families hold the fountain of power their scions will also have advantage in the leading service-professions, in the Army, and in the Church, where there is a national establishment. This was the constitution of England, and is still in a modified degree. For a century and a half after the Revolution of 1688 the English system was perhaps the most aristocratic in Europe, except that of the Venetian Republic, because real power had passed from the Crown to a group of great families. It was more an oligarchy than an aristocracy. When the Crown holds its own the great families are not so powerful. Absolute monarchs prefer the use of Ministers of low degree because they are more pliant and hardworking, and save the King trouble. Cardinal Pole, in his "open letter" to Henry VIII., written in safety from abroad, accuses that king of giving his confidence to none except men drawn from the lowest orders, like Thomas Cromwell, and St. Simon says that Louis XIV. never, during his long reign, admitted a single nobleman, except the Duke of Beauvilliers, to his inner council. He kept the great families in leash by giving them such "graces" as bishoprics, nominal

Aristocracy

governments, sinecure posts and pensions, but jealously withheld any share in real power.

In England the power of the aristocracy has waned slowly since the first Reform Act transferred the balance of ultimate power to the middle classes, and since subsequent extensions transferred much of it to the working classes. No Liberal Government, and perhaps no Conservative, seems likely again to be so aristocratic as that which Gladstone formed in 1880. No previous English Cabinet was so little aristocratic as that which came into office in 1905, although it was aristocratic compared with any French Government since 1877. The war, and nothing less, has recalled our aristocracy to a share in power. It will be interesting to see whether it will have the same result in France.

On the whole, however, the aristocratic class, which held supreme power in England till modern times, still holds a share of it, and indirectly influences affairs even more than directly. This class has had a strong voice in the House of Commons, besides possessing a second Chamber all to itself, and has held a dominant position at the top of most great departments. Almost exclusively, like the Roman Senators, they have directed and still direct foreign policy. Sir Edward Grey belongs to the caste quite as much as Lord Lansdowne or the late Lord Salisbury.

Under aristocratic rule, backed by middle-class energy, the British Empire has grown to its present stature. The son of a great house still has the best chance in political life, though to succeed he must have better brains and more energy than formerly. The gentleman is still everywhere the natural leader in peace and war, and he is not yet debarred, as in France and Ireland, by a strong caste prejudice against him. The Teutonic race, to which mainly belong England and Germany and the Scandinavian peoples, is by nature loyal to high-born chiefs. Englishmen wish themselves to enter the ruling caste, not to destroy it, and levelling tendencies in these islands are, perhaps, due

Aristocracy

to the Celtic element. The son of the old-established family has, however, to meet vastly increased competition in every arena of action. The substitution of competitive examination for nomination in the Home and Indian Civil services has been dead against him, since his brains are not of the keenly competitive kind. The Eton-trained boy has small chance in the examination room against a rival of Jewish or German or middle-class Scottish blood. Entrance examinations and the public money spent on secondary schools have driven the "younger son" either into trade and finance in England or into the rough life of the outer empire where his gifts are still of value.

Mr. Ludovici, in his too sweeping way, judges the modern English aristocracy to be a failure from the political point of view, and he dates the failure back to the seventeenth century. He does not at all agree with Chateaubriand, who, writing in 1822, said of the English aristocracy :

L'aristocratie éclairée placée à la tête de ce pays depuis cent quarante ans (1688) aura montrée au monde une des plus belles et des plus grandes sociétés qui aient fait honneur à l'espèce humaine depuis le patriciat romain.

But Chateaubriand already saw signs of decrepitude, which had, he thought, much advanced since he first lived in England at the end of the eighteenth century :

Les lords de la Grande Charte sont aujourd'hui les "fashionables" de Bond Street, race frivole qui campe dans les manoirs antiques en attendant l'arrivée des générations nouvelles qui s'apprentent à les en chasser.

Chateaubriand never could resist a beautiful phrase, and his judgments both as to the older aristocracy and the new need revision. But, politically, there certainly has been a decline, if not a downfall. Mr. Ludovici says with justice that the stroke of State against the House of Lords consummated on that fatal day, August

Aristocracy

10th, 1911, could not have succeeded had not the British aristocracy, like the French before the Revolution, failed in certain essentials, and lost the hold which it once had upon popular respect or imagination. He agrees with Mr. Arthur Ponsonby, who contends in his able book, *The Decline of Aristocracy*, that the main cause of the decline is internal rot and loss not merely of external esteem but of adequate self-esteem. No one will believe in an Aristocracy any more than in a Church, which does not believe in itself, and also act as if it so believed. The English aristocrats are much less valiant in the field of theory and logic than they are on the field of battle. But the decline is also due to the general decay of imaginative power. No one, no king, duke or bishop, in this realistic age, seems so great as did those of old who moved in a world possessed of childhood's delightful gift of imagination and make-believe. All the more important is it that real qualities and sound training should justify social position. Mr. Ludovici maintains that the British aristocracy of the last two or three centuries have not, on the whole, possessed these qualities. An aristocracy, he thinks, should have a certain full, or, as he calls it, "flourishing," vitality, which should enable it instinctively to select what is good and reject what is bad both for its own existence and that of the nation. This is the work of fine taste in living, and this—of all men—those of high birth should possess. The health, joviality and good spirits of the nation should be their constant care, and they should avoid Puritanism like the devil. This is his theory. But, in his opinion, the British Aristocracy, intent on their own selfish interests and pleasures, allowed Puritanism, which subconsciously followed its own middle-class commercial instincts, to depress by a false view of life the vitality of the working classes in order to make better wage-slaves of Englishmen. According to the theory they allowed the old "Merry England" of Catholic ages to pass away, the middle-class interest to prevail against justice, the health of

Aristocracy

the nation to be sacrificed to the wealth of part of it. The last great stand against all this was made by Mr. Ludovici's favourite statesmen, Charles I., Strafford, and Laud, and it failed because they were deserted by part of the English and Scottish nobility. Hence, when the working classes obtained their share of power in the nineteenth century, they had no reason to feel grateful to the Aristocracy and witnessed its downfall with pleasure or indifference. England had been sold by Whigs for the sake of urban rents and political power to manufacturing capitalists; the population had been driven into great cities and factories, and the strength of rural feudalism was gone. Hence, at last, Mr. Asquith and the fatal August 10th, 1911.

All this is the anti-Liberal theme of William Cobbett, followed by Disraeli in his romances *Coningsby* and *Sybil*. These writers say that an Aristocracy, founded upon the confiscation of monastic lands, that glorious "steal," and biased by this origin in all subsequent policy, in its great rebellion, glorious revolution, French wars, and National Debt, has tainted the happiness, health, and contentment of the English people. Against all this must be balanced the consideration that the engrossment by the rich of the soil of England drove forth a hardy, warlike, and adventurous race into the ends of the earth to found the British Empire, while the manufacturing cities built on suffering served as a storehouse of potential energy. But will either empire or wealth be durable if the health of the centre decays? Internal decay at the centre is often the price of empire.

Mr. Ludovici attributes what is, in his opinion, the failure of the British Aristocracy to the fact that it is not pure-bred. After the Wars of the Roses had almost destroyed the old Norman caste, the Tudor kings founded a new nobility out of men of plebeian stock, the men whose hard materialistic faces look out from Holbein's too veracious portraits. Since then this noblesse has been continually replenished from the lesser orders, and in order to maintain its

Aristocracy

wealth has sacrificed careful selection by marriage. Now, although, in order to refresh the blood and prevent stock-degeneration, occasional cross-breeding within certain limits is desirable; yet, on the whole, if a caste or a nation—which is a wider caste—is to maintain the character which makes its strength, then cross-breeding, frequent or beyond certain limits, must be avoided. The reason is that a man who combines in himself two or more remote and dissimilar races resembles a country like old Poland or modern Mexico, torn by internal and antagonistic factions. He has no unity in himself, and, consequently, small power to decide and act externally. The analogy between an ill-regulated man and a democracy is as old as Plato. If the Celt and the Saxon, or the Teuton and the Slav, or the aristocrat and plebeian, or the warrior and the philosopher are at too equal civil war within his breast, such a man will resemble the undecided characters of Shakespeare, a Hamlet, a Macbeth, a Richard II., a Mark Antony. For successful action he should be a man of unity of character, all of a piece, and, therefore, of undivided aim, a Bolingbroke or Octavius Cæsar. Therefore his parents and grandparents and earlier ancestors should be persons of resembling race and character. Thus the family, the caste, and, in a wider circle, the nation, should be as pure-bred as possible. "All is race," said Disraeli, who attributed to the pure breeding of the Israelites their survival and success through all adversities, their unwearying perseverance, and hard brain-power. Both the laws of Moses and the antipathy of English colonists to Oriental immigration are based upon a consciousness of this. The Roman Empire declined and fell because the pure Roman breed, never more than a film over its surface, was lost in a chaos of races, and the American Republic may come to nothing truly great unless its English breed discontinue their practice of dying out, and also keep their caste fairly intact by marriage. Mixed races may excel in intelligence, and perhaps in some arts. such

Aristocracy

as music, but they will not possess that character and guidance by instinct which makes a ruling caste or a great nation. The natural instinct in men sound of mind and body is to marry women like to their own kin. If instinct guides them to marry the unlike it is, our author suggests, because they are in an unhealthy condition and subconscious of defects which they wish to eliminate from their race. Breeders know that, if a horse and a mare are free from defects, the nearer akin they are the better are the results.

These ideas Count Gobineau, one of the world's few original thinkers, first expressed, and Houston Chamberlain, in a German interest, has recently carried them above the line of exaggeration. Mr. Ludovici restates them well and lucidly. His main positions are : (1) that a nation, to be great, should itself be of as pure breed as possible, and that, above all, its affairs should be directed by an hereditary caste of the purest blood, and (2) that the British aristocracy, by reason of its origin, mode of recruitment, and want of true selection in marriage, has failed to maintain this ideal, and has consequently lost moral and actual power. He suggests as a practical remedy that the titled order should have a voice, or at least a veto, in the adoption of new families, so that mere wealth or contributions to the funds of political parties should not be sufficient qualification. This, probably, would not work well, but there might certainly be a tribunal with the power to remove degraded and degenerate families from the roll of nobility. Why, for instance, should a peer who marries a mulatto continue to perpetuate half-caste members of the British Legislature? For the rest, Mr. Ludovici's curative method lies in self-reform on the part of the aristocracy. They are to be more conscientiously careful as to purity of race in marriage ; they are to be more generous and discerning patrons of art and literature ; to sacrifice some of their pleasures and amusements in order to learn and think ; they are to endeavour to form true conceptions of what things

Aristocracy

make a nation strong, happy, and healthy ; and they are to take the trouble to lead. In so far as the English upper class have been wanting in these matters the great war should be a remedy, by sweeping away phantoms and teaching a truer scale of values.

A disciple of Nietzsche may probably not agree to our view that a true aristocracy must observe the precepts of the Christian religion. "The royal and noble dignity," says the old writer Gilles de Rome, in his *Mirror of Chivalrous Virtue*, "arises from the fear of God." The social position of nobles, or of kings, who are but the first of nobles, will be endured by the peoples if they see that kings and nobles are, and profess to be, servants of a still higher power. This was so in the Middle Ages, as it had been in the heroic ages of Greece and Rome, and therefore, with all its faults, aristocratic rule in those ages endured so long. But the Reformation did much to weaken the position. The principle laid down by St. Ambrose that emperors should not be extra-Ecclesiam but intra-Ecclesiam was abandoned. Even in France Fénelon had to say that "Gallican liberties are true servitudes"—servitudes to Louis XIV. And Princes who ceased to be sons of the Catholic Church and became heads of their own local Churches profoundly altered the relation in which they stood to their peoples. Instead of an elder brother, such a Prince became a master. The Church belonged to him, not he to the Church. The position of landowners each in his own parish, was altered in like manner. When, in the eighteenth century, many kings and nobles went further, and in fact, if not in words, abjured the service of God, they destroyed the spirit of allegiance in the people and paved the way for the chariots of Revolution. However great may be the material and political benefits of hereditary monarchy or aristocratic rule, the people will not endure it unless they see that monarchs and nobles are themselves servants and recognize a power above themselves. Without this a privileged position is not intelligible. The service of a personified

Aristocracy

"State" is not enough, nor is personal, private, unseen religion, nor even membership of a purely National Church, which is but one aspect of the State. In the end the position of hereditary monarchs and nobles rests upon the belief that their power comes not from below but from above, and that they have duties corresponding to rights and favours. The decline, so often remarked, in the dignity of fathers and mothers with respect to their children, the falling off of reverence and discipline in family life, is at least partly due to the decline in formal religious observance. And yet this dignity and discipline, the maintenance of the *patria potestas*, is essential to the education of a true aristocracy. Serious men will no longer be bred, except perhaps by military discipline, in a society no longer leavened by religious belief and practice, nor will a son honour his father unless from early boyhood he sees by visible signs that his father honours an unseen but ever-present Deity. The Catholic and Roman Church is the true school of parents and masters, of kings and nobles. It teaches with a weight of authority which no merely National Church can possibly possess that reverence for things above, around, and below which Goethe thought so essential to real education. A great Protestant historian, Guizot, said, "Le Catholicisme est la plus grande, la plus sainte, école de respect qu'ait jamais vue le monde." Shakespeare says :

Take but degree away, untune that string,
And, hark ! what discord follows !

But if religion, the supreme keystone of all degree, is removed the whole edifice will sooner or later crumble away. Without degree, adds the poet, force becomes right, all is resolved into will and will into mere appetite, which at last devours itself.

If men and women are descended from a long line of ancestors, who have led lives of more refinement and leisure than the mass of mortals, and if their morality is

Aristocracy

guarded and strengthened, and their pride softened by true religion into noble humility, there is, then, no doubt in these a touch of finer perfection than can be found elsewhere. Madame de la Ferronays, in the *Récit d'une Sœur*, writes concerning a son :—

Je suis bien aise, je te l'avoue de le savoir dans un entourage franchement aristocratique ; cette influence est excellente pour lui. Quelle idée ! vas-tu dire, peut-être, Eh bien ! oui ! il y a dans un entourage de cette sorte des choses qui coulent de source, et qui ne se produisent pas aussi naturellement dans les terrains où aucune vieille sève n'a germé ; je l'ai trop vu, trop senti pour n'en pas être convaincue ; ce qui n'empêche pas pourtant que bien des gens de bonne race se permettent des actions qui démentent leur origine—mais je parle en général.

That is precisely so. There is something in this society, "frankly aristocratic," which comes straight from the source, and is not imitation. This is the strength of things born, not made, founded upon antiquity. There is something analogous to this in the case of the intellectual aristocracy. A man who is well educated in the masterpieces of ancient wisdom and style has a free and direct judgment, because he has a real standard, and his conversation and writing are easy and simple and unaffected. After all, the political business of a nation's affairs is not the only, and possibly it is not the finest, sphere in which aristocracy can take its part ; war, love, religion, art, administration of land and local affairs would remain if an absolute king and his officials conducted all central affairs, but it is the rôle of aristocracy in these last that Mr. Ludovici discusses, and his reviewer must follow him.

What, then, are the advantages, and what the disadvantages, of the dominancy of an aristocratic caste in national counsels and affairs ? Certainly in foreign and commercial policy an aristocratic system seems superior either to a pure monarchic or to a democratic. Aristocratic policy is likely to be more continuous and consistent

Aristocracy

than monarchic, more in touch with national needs and instincts, and it will not be deflected by dynastic motives or personal feelings, such as those which ruined France under Louis XIV. It will also be more continuous than the policy of a democracy, and less swayed by sentimentalities and oratory and transient emotions. Aristocratic government does not depend, like pure hereditary monarchy, upon the chance which may transfer power from a strong and wise man to a weak and vain fool, nor, like a democracy, upon the chance, almost as blind, which may replace a wise but unpopular statesman by an incapable but popular orator. Aristocracy is likely to be led in the great external affairs of a nation by instinctive sagacity and inherited experience. If faculties are gradually acquired and are transmitted, men of a true-bred aristocracy should have an inborn instinct for rule, just as one breed of dogs inherits a capacity for finding game, another for herding sheep. Since statesmanship depends more upon character than upon intellect, the gift for it is transmissible, though it is not always transmitted. If you select individuals from this class, and train them early and rightly, you have the best chance to obtain good head managers of public affairs. In training them you work on the best raw material available for that purpose. The late Duke of Devonshire was an admirable specimen of this type. He was not a man of distinguished or highly educated intellect, but he had an excellent instinct for the right, though not always the most popular, line of action. Inborn sagacity of this kind is fortified by that education through conversation and surroundings which boys of great political houses obtain from earliest years. In an aristocratic system men can enter upon political or official business earlier in life than those who first have to make a name and income in other business. Thus they learn the art in those years when men are not too old to learn. Men of this breed and training have the independence of judgment and the degree of scepticism with regard to false sentiments which are very necessary ingredients in the

Aristocracy

character of a practical statesman. These are great advantages. And now what are the disadvantages?

The main disadvantage is that an aristocratic class is likely to be swayed by selfish interest in managing the internal affairs of a nation. A nobility must be, or at least always has been, founded upon great possessions in land or other forms of wealth. Just as a rich man cannot easily enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, so also it is difficult for him, even with the best intentions, to look with impartial justice at questions involving distribution of means of living. Democratic governments have also shown themselves deficient in this sense of justice, but it is perhaps better that the rich should suffer loss than that the poor should. In theory impartial justice should be best obtained under pure monarchic rule, but in practice an hereditary monarch finds it difficult to make his will prevail against that of interests immediately surrounding his throne. For this same reason that nobles are usually rich they are inclined to be somewhat indolent in public affairs. A nation whose affairs have long been controlled by an indolent aristocracy may be at a disadvantage if it comes into collision with a strong monarch, a dynasty which has known how to select, and work through, vigorous experts.

Perhaps, for the world as it now stands, the best constitution, if it were possible, which a great nation could adopt would be that of a monarchy conducting general, military, naval, and external affairs with the aid of assemblies and councils in which advantage should be given to the aristocratic class, while, on the other hand, free and large *provincial* parliaments and administrations, resting upon the most democratic basis, dealt well or ill with all that which is called "social legislation." Then there would be some prospect of obtaining strength and continuity in external and commercial policy, while avoiding injustice to the poorer classes of the nation. Disraeli, through the oracular Sidonia, in *Coningsby*, predicted the decline of the power of the House of

Aristocracy

Commons, and said, "The tendency of advanced civilization is in truth to pure monarchy."

Parliamentary representation was the device of a ruder age, to which it was admirably adapted, when there was a leading class in the community, but it exhibits many signs of desuetude. It is controlled by a system of representation, more vigorous and comprehensive, which absorbs its duties and fulfils them more efficiently, and in which discussion is pursued on fairer terms, and often with more depth and information. . . . If we are forced to revolutions, let us propose to our consideration the idea of a free monarchy, established on fundamental laws, itself the apex of a vast pile of municipal and local government, ruling an educated people, represented by a free and intellectual press.

This Sidonian ideal is more nearly fulfilled in the German Empire than anywhere else. There we see the really governing king, we see admirably well developed sub-national, provincial, and municipal, governments, an educated people, and a press which is undeniably intellectual, and, as to freedom, not, perhaps, more under a yoke of some kind or other than is the press in most countries. Is the result a success? The system has led Germany to wealth and power; is it also not leading her to a catastrophe? The difficulty there, as ever, has been that, in a monarchy which is both hereditary and real, the fortunes of a great nation, its life and wealth and happiness, are staked too much upon the character of a single man. The Patriot Prince may be the best method of government, but you are not at all sure of getting him by the process of breeding. Our Whig oligarchy met this difficulty by placing almost all real power in a Committee of Parliament and leaving only dignity to the king. But this contrivance, with later developments, has landed us in difficulties and weaknesses of another kind. Hereditary monarchy is not, however, the only species of monarchy which has existed, and it is not the only species which the imagination can conceive. At Rome may be seen in action a spiritual world-wide monarchy. It is certainly not hereditary, but it has endured for many

Aristocracy

centuries with expanding dominion, and it is inferior to none in dignity, wisdom, and power. One can conceive a monarchy based upon election by a suitable body, resembling the College of Cardinals, which would meet the needs of that secular communion, *late valideque diffusa per orbem*, called the British Empire.

The immediate practical question in this country is not the re-establishment of an aristocratic *régime*—this hardly anyone could expect or desire—but in what way the decline of the valuable aristocratic element in our constitution can be prevented from going too far. No man of sense can wish that the element of hereditary aristocracy should be driven out of English public life so completely as it has been driven out in France, and, thank heaven! this does not seem probable. The most obvious practical suggestion is that of a reform which should improve, and so strengthen, the House of Lords. The reform should be coupled with a restoration of the political power of which that House was deprived on August 10, 1911, but even without such formal restoration it would probably serve its purpose. The House of Lords should, according to the best opinion, consist of a limited number of hereditary peers elected, after the existing Scottish method, by the rest; the other men who sit in that House should be peers nominated by the Crown for life only, as now are Bishops and Law Lords, and there might be other peers, *ex-officio*, for certain public services. The Assembly so composed would be at once a far more select and far more disinterested body than it is now. It would resemble the Roman Senate in its best days. It would combine the worthiest members of the hereditary caste with men of the intellectual aristocracy. The House of Lords, as it is, contains a far greater strength of experts in the essential business of the British Empire than does the House of Commons. It might easily be made into a body more distinguished and widely representative of imperial interests than any which ever existed in the world's history.

BERNARD HOLLAND

THE USE OF AIRCRAFT IN THE PRESENT WAR

CONSIDERING the important rôle that aircraft are playing in the present conflict, it would seem almost incredible to those who do not know it as fact, that only a little more than two years ago a public meeting had to be called at the Mansion House to urge the necessity for the national adoption of the new arm, and the bestowal of liberal grants on the service of the air. As serious aeronautical activity on the part of the Government of this country may be said to date from the time of that meeting, nothing short of the highest praise can be given to those who have brought the national aerial equipment, in so short a time, to the high state of efficiency displayed at the very commencement of this terrible war. Though the number of aeroplanes then available was not very large—about one hundred—still the services of the Royal Flying Corps rendered by their means were such that Sir John French, in his report of September 11, 1914, was able to say: "The British Flying Corps has succeeded in establishing an individual ascendancy which is as serviceable to us as it is damaging to the enemy." This ascendancy at the time was brought about by individual pluck and dexterity, combined with certain requisite qualities in the machines used. The Germans at that time were relying chiefly upon the Taubes—the mono-planes with dove-like wings—which gave a great deal of stability, but were not so speedy as the British type. They had hardly reckoned that in this war the aeroplane would become an offensive instrument, and appear to have regarded aircraft on the heavier than air principle, solely as means for scouting, and directing and correcting artillery fire. In fact it appears that the German pilots had orders to evade combat if possible, so as to keep their machines intact for the above-mentioned

Use of Aircraft in Present War

uses. Through British enterprise, however, they were unable to do this. It was, indeed, the presence of large numbers of German machines for the purpose of directing their artillery, which was having devastating effect, that made the British aviators use their aeroplanes as weapons of offence. For it was realised at a very early stage of the war that the side which had the power of diminishing the number of the enemy's aeroplanes would have a great advantage over the other. The aeroplane is, indeed, responsible for the elimination of secrecy, which so distinguishes modern warfare from that of our ancestors, and which makes machinery rather than individual genius the chief factor of victory.

As time has gone on, the Germans have realized that aeroplanes have to be fighting machines as well as air scouts and artillery guides, and have brought into prominence machines other than the Taubes, notably biplanes of the Aviatik type. These are said to be both fast and capable of carrying formidable machine guns. There have also been seen over the French lines twin-engined machines with single fuselages, which have been credited with carrying a weapon heavier than a machine gun, and capable of firing a shell, though it was probably some kind of case shot it was firing. Then there are the reported large German biplanes with two fuselages and an engine in each—an idea apparently taken from the Italian Caproni. But, despite the new additions to the German aerial resources, Sir John French was able to say in his report dated June 15, 1915, "Since my last dispatch there has been a considerable increase both in the number and in the activity of German aeroplanes in our front. During this period there have been more than sixty combats in the air in which not one British aeroplane has been lost. As these fights take place almost invariably over or behind the British lines, only one hostile aeroplane has been brought down in our territory. Five more, however, have been definitely wrecked behind their own lines, and many have been chased down and forced to land

The Use of Aircraft

in most unsuitable ground. In spite of the opposition of hostile aircraft, and the great number of anti-aircraft guns employed by the enemy, air reconnaissance has been carried out with regularity and accuracy."

This testimony seems to show that in spite of undoubted improvements in the German aeroplanes, the British pilots are still showing that they possess a skill and dexterity in the air far superior to the kind displayed by the slower and more methodical Teutons, not that it is unimportant to keep thoroughly abreast of the mechanical improvements of the enemy, and to produce what will counteract the venom of his newer devices. Though it is impossible at this time of national crisis to publish any details of what is being done by way of development or improvement, which time and practice have dictated, still there can be no doubt that the aerial authorities in this country are fully alive to the necessity of meeting the needs of the moment.

This cannot be done by attempting to put into execution wild schemes for the sudden production of ten thousand aeroplanes, such as have been lately extravagantly proposed by those who have indulged in the dream that aeronautics is the arm that will end the war, but rather by the fullest appreciation of practical possibility.

It may be of interest in this article to review the three principal uses of the aeroplane as revealed in this war, and point out some of the salient features in aeroplanes these uses exact.

I. RECONNAISSANCE.

The supreme use of the aeroplane in war is undoubtedly as a scout. We can now hardly imagine an army devoid of aerial scouts. They are necessary to its very existence. Yet only a few years back funds for the military development of the aeroplane were grudging in this country, as if they were to be spent on the folly of enthusiasts. Never has prejudice so obstinately clung to any development of practical science as it did to the

in the Present War

flying machine, despite the fact that the world is indebted to Great Britain for the knowledge of most of the underlying principles which have made human flight possible. It is war that has caused the scales of prejudice to fall from the public eye. Now, it is on all sides admitted that the use of the aeroplane in the present struggle is the greatest monument ever raised to the pioneers of the conquest of the air.

The use of the aerial scout was vividly foreshadowed in the Boer War, by the performances of the captive observation balloons—a method still retained to some extent. Few, perhaps, then realised what we owed to the observers in those captive balloons. The Boers, however, fully grasped their utility to their foe. One of the Boer prisoners is said to have remarked when captured, "If ever we catch the man in the balloon we will make mincemeat of him. He is the one that does us most harm. We could not move, we could not creep from one stone to the other, but he saw us and pointed us out, and we will pay him for it if we lay hands on him." In that campaign the balloon saved Ladysmith, and averted what would have been a prodigious disaster to our army at Spion Kop. But what vastly greater issues were decided in our favour at the beginning of the present war by the aeroplane!

One of these critical occasions was when the British Expeditionary Force, soon after landing in France, had taken up a position on the French left. There were two army corps facing the enemy with a third in reserve. The two former extended from Condé to Binche. On the evening of August 23 Sir John French received a telegram from General Joffre that the Germans had thrust their way across the Sambre, and were forcing the French to retire, while the two British Corps were threatened by three German army corps on their front, and by a fourth stealing round them for a flank attack.

The way in which the British aeroplanes then came to the rescue has been graphically described in the newly-

The Use of Aircraft

published work *Aircraft in the Great War*, by C. Grahame-White and H. Harper.

"The position could not have been more critical. The French falling back left our army exposed; on neither flank had it protection. And the Germans, pressing forward irresistibly, were on the eve of a crushing attack. Evening was at hand, it will be remembered, before Sir John French had this news; a few hours only of daylight remained. Yet to hesitate was to court destruction. Something must be done, and done at once; the menace was one which could be met only by a swift, unwavering plan. That night the commander-in-chief must frame his scheme, and at dawn his army must be in motion. But there was a preliminary, and a vital one; this was to ascertain, if there yet remained time in which to do so, the exact positions and approximate strengths of the threatening hosts. Cavalry scouts, of course, were available, but conditions were against them; the area to be traversed was large, darkness almost at hand. Next morning, perhaps—but next morning would be too late. Information was needed now. Here, made for them by circumstance, was just the opportunity our flying men required. Not only was scouting needed, but it was needed in haste—in such haste, indeed, that no craft, save the aeroplane itself, could have brought back the news in time. In a flash there went a message to the aircraft base, and out upon their errands flew the fastest scouts. At twice the pace of an express train, rushing smoothly through the air, went these high-speed craft; and their pilots, peering down on the land below, had a view as from a mountain top. Out and away, each machine on its given path, sped these flying scouts. And in an hour, thanks to their tremendous speed, they had gleaned news that could have been procured only in a day by any other means. They found the hostile forces that were destined for a main attack, marked their positions on their maps, made estimates of their strength; they located also with accuracy

in the Present War

the flanking movement which was so grave a menace. And this work was done, as it needed to be done, at lightning speed. The aircraft had leaped upward and disappeared; then, in a space of time that seemed incredibly short, they were swooping earthward again, their mission done. Sir John French given the news he sought, and by an instrument of which he, of the great commanders in war, was the first to make striking use, was able to frame his plans that night with swiftness and precision; and next day at dawn, showing a doggedness that can never be forgotten, our little army began its hazardous retreat."

These observation flights were followed by others which will be historical. When Von Kluck found it would be a hopeless task to invest Paris, and changed his plan, stopping his south advance upon Paris, and moving his main column instead in a south-easterly direction, it was the observing aeroplanes which discovered his new movement. This was news of extreme importance and caused the Allies to abandon the defensive and make instead a vigorous attack. Von Kluck's flank was then threatened by powerful armies which ensured the well-known precipitous German retreat—a retreat which can be ascribed to the services of airmen.

But in connection with this famous retreat the aeroplanes rendered still further services. There is risk in pressing too closely on the heels of a retreating foe, for, if the retreat is made in good order, an enemy can sometimes find positions favourable for turning round to make a counter-attack. It became then the task of the aeroplanists to go up and see how far the retreat was general; whether it was merely a trick of Von Kluck to allure the Allies on and then to turn round and deal a crushing blow. Right well did the aerial scouts perform their work. They flew over the German rearguard, and penetrated deep into the enemy's lines to see that everywhere the German retreat was complete.

It is evident from the above three examples of the use of the aeroplane as a scout that an important attribute

The Use of Aircraft

of a scouting aeroplane may often be its swiftness. This quality renders the swifter class of aeroplanes, in which the pilot ascends alone, and combines in himself the duties of pilot and observer, exceedingly useful when swift reconnaissance has to be undertaken. It used to be thought that monoplanes would be specially useful for this work, but the tendency has been to discard the monoplane in favour of the biplane. Our own Government some time before the war considered the monoplane unsuited for military operations. The French, since the war has been in progress, have forbidden the use of the Blériot, Deperdussin, Nieuport, and R.E.P. monoplanes, retaining only one example—the Morane-Saulnier. The Germans, too, appear to be coming to the same conclusion.

The selection of the biplane in preference to monoplanes for the stress and strain of war is a testimony to the genius of that British pioneer in aerial navigation, who, years ago, may be said to have invented the biplane. It was, in fact, as early as 1866 that Wenham read his classical paper on the value of superposed surfaces before the Aeronautical Society of Great Britain. His work was vividly reflected in the efforts of Sir Hiram Maxim in the last decade of the last century, in the gliding flights of Lilienthal, Chanute, and bore final practical fruit in the motor-driven biplane of the Brothers Wright.

One type of British biplane used in the war has been remarkable for its swiftness, and has been credited at times with a speed of over 130 miles an hour. Owing to its speed it has proved to be invaluable for making a rapid reconnaissance, and its very fleetness is its best protection from enemy gun fire. This quality of speed in flying machines in itself endows them with stability, while all goes well with them, but machines in which everything is sacrificed to speed require very expert handling. It is extremely desirable that the large majority of military aeroplanes should possess inherent stability; for such machines can be piloted by those

in the Present War

who are less expert than those qualified to drive machines designed for extreme speed. During the war it became necessary to train pilots very rapidly. The amount of stability attained in one type of British aeroplanes has enabled comparative beginners to become quite dextrous in handling them. The introduction of the means to produce inherent stability in an aeroplane tends, however, to slow the machine, and in designing any particular class of machine it must be considered how far speed should be sacrificed to stability. A very happy result has been attained in the form of stable aeroplane which is made in the Royal Aircraft Factory, and was due to the labours of the late Mr. E. T. Busk. On one of these machines this promising inventor was burnt to death in the air on November 5, 1914, and thus joined the long roll of the martyrs of science.

Though it is not permissible to give any details of this excellent machine, the following remarks, testifying to its peculiar efficiency which were supplied to the *Aeronautical Journal*, January, 1915, by Mr. Mervyn O'Gorman, the superintendent of the Royal Aircraft Factory, may here be quoted.

Speaking of the late Mr. E. T. Busk he says :

"By the autumn of 1913 he had carried out his researches so far that complete stability without material loss of efficiency could be obtained for any aeroplane designed in accordance with his results. In November, 1913, he was able to make flights of several hours' duration in winds up to thirty-eight miles per hour, without at any time using any balancing, controlling, or steering mechanism whatever save for alighting purposes."

Indirectly we can ascribe the attainment of stability in aeroplanes to the profound mathematical researches of Professor Bryan, and thus to the honour of this country belongs the attainment of the great desideratum for the success of human flight.

It was near the beginning of the present century that the author of this article had a conversation with Professor Bryan at the Royal Institution on the subject of the

The Use of Aircraft

experiments with gliding machines that up to that time had been made, and the latter then gave expression to some of those suggestions which he has since so successfully elaborated. At that time the author asked him if he would prepare a paper on the subject of his original ideas as to the mathematical treatment of the problem of Flight, to be read before the Aeronautical Society of Great Britain, and the result of that conversation was the epoch-making and classical paper published in the *Aeronautical Journal*, January, 1904. This has influenced the attainment of stability in flight throughout the world, and the principles it teaches have been successfully applied at the Royal Aircraft Factory in conjunction with the experimental work of the National Physical Laboratory.

The researches of Professor Bryan are reflected in the German Taubes—luckily for us ; for in these, speed has been sacrificed to stability. The Taubes consequently fell victims to the speedier and more nimble British machines.

In aerial reconnaissance it is often desirable that a large amount of detail of observation should be furnished to headquarters, more than can be grasped by one who has to act as both observer and pilot. Then there becomes need of the type of aircraft that will carry an observing officer as well as pilot, who will take up with him maps and glasses and devote himself entirely to the study of the land beneath him. Such machines are of necessity slower than those which carry the solitary pilot, and they run more risk of being overtaken by the enemy. But besides the advantage of division of labour, there is also the benefit that if either pilot or observing officer is killed or wounded by a shot from a pursuing enemy machine, the one that escapes can pilot the machine back to friendly lines, or if the engine of the machine is silenced, or petrol tank perforated, the art of volplaning, which has so often saved a machine from landing within the precincts of the enemy, can be put into execution.

in the Present War

It is very advisable that the faster type of aeroplane designed to carry two aviators should possess dual control. In some of these machines the occupants sit in separate apertures in the tube-like hulls and cannot move about during flight, so should the pilot be killed the survivor cannot get access to his seat to manipulate the machine. The levers or steering wheel and rudder bars should therefore be in front of each, and it is essential to employ disconnecting apparatus to ensure that each set of levers can be worked independently of the other.

The Farman biplanes in peace were renowned for their endurance qualities, often winning the world's records for duration of flight. These qualities have been of no little value in war, and the Farman machines have been used for the more prolonged and searching reconnoitring duties such as the strategical reconnaissance, as distinct from the hurried tactical observations which have fallen to the lot of the swifter machines.

Some of the difficulties of aerial reconnaissance will be found well described in a new and useful little work, *Aeroplanes and Dirigibles of War*, by F. A. Talbot. "At first sight reconnoitring from above may appear a simple operation, but a little reflection will reveal the difficulties and arduousness of the work. The observer, whether he be specially deputed or whether the work be placed in the hand of the pilot himself—in this event the operation is rendered additionally trying, as he also has to attend to his machine—must keep his eyes glued to the ground beneath and at the same time be able to read the configuration of the panorama revealed to him. He must also keep in touch with his map and compass, so as to be positive of his position and direction. He must be a first-class judge of distances and heights.

"When flying rapidly at a height of 4,000 feet or more, the country below appears as a perfect plane, or flat stretch, although as a matter of fact it may be extremely undulating. Consequently it is by no means a simple matter to distinguish eminences and depressions, or to determine the respective and relative heights of hills.

The Use of Aircraft

"If a rough sketch is required, the observer must be rapid in thought, quick in determination, and facile with his pencil, as the machine, no matter how it may be slowed down, is moving at a relatively high speed. He must consult his map and compass frequently, since an airman who loses his bearings is useless to his commander-in-chief. He must have an eagle eye, so as to be able to search the country unfolded below, in order to gather all the information which is likely to be of value to his superior officers. He must be able to judge accurately the numbers of troops arrayed beneath him, the lines of the defensive works, to distinguish between the defended from the dummy lines which are thrown up to baffle him, and to detect instantly the movement of the troops and the direction, as well as the roads along which they are proceeding. Reserves and their complement, artillery railway lines, roads and bridges, if any, over streams and railways must be noted: in short he must obtain an eye-photograph of the country he observes and grasp exactly what is happening there. In winter, with the thermometer well down, a blood-freezing wind blowing, wreaths of clouds drifting below and obscuring vision for minutes at a time, the rain possibly pelting down as if presaging a second deluge, the plight of the vigilant human eye aloft is far from enviable."

2. DIRECTING AND CORRECTING ARTILLERY FIRE.

It is difficult to overestimate the utility of the aeroplane for directing artillery. In modern warfare the sight of the gunners is no longer their own. Implicitly they must obey the directions which come from above.

As has been mentioned, at the beginning of the war, the Germans were particularly active in directing their artillery fire by means of their aeroplanes, which were present in large quantities. When the German Army compelled the retreat at Mons the fire of their artillery was devastating for the very reason that their airmen, who hovered over the British lines, pointed out the spots where gun fire could do the maximum of harm.

in the Present War

The following story told in *Aeroplanes and Dirigibles of War* illustrates the powers of the aeroplane in this respect: "A number of our men were resting in an open field immediately behind the second line of trenches, being, in fact, the reserves intended for the relief of the front lines during the following night. An aeroplane hove in sight. The men dropped their kits and got under cover in an adjacent wood. The aeroplane was flying at a great height and evidently laboured under the impression that the kits were men. Twice it flew over the field in the usual manner, and then the storm of shrapnel, 'Jack Johnsons,' and other tokens from the Kaiser rained upon the confined space. A round four hundred shells were dropped into that field in the short period of ten minutes, and the range was so accurate that no single shell fell outside the space. Had the men not hurried to cover not one would have been left alive to tell the tale, because every square foot of the land was searched through and through. We laughed at the shortsightedness of the airman who had contributed to such a waste of valuable shot and shell, but at the same time appreciated the narrowness of our own escape."

The Germans have several methods of manifesting to the artillery the instructions of the aerial observers.

One plan is to drop smoke bombs over the position. These leave a thick black smoky line which enables the gunners to take the exact range. They also use a silver ball, and it has been described how almost simultaneously with the dropping of this ball the shell bursts over the lines of the opposing forces. Then they have a method of pulling up and down a little disc suspended beneath the aeroplane. Another favourite plan is to let fall a handful of tinsel, which glitters in the sunlight.

At night-time operations have mainly to be conducted by the use of coloured lights, or by an electric signalling lamp. It appears that the accuracy of the airman's work in communicating the range has been responsible for the high efficiency of the British and French artillery.

The Use of Aircraft

The latter with the 75-millimetre gun is particularly adapted to following up the results of the aeroplane reconnaissance.

The British system has also proved disastrous to the Germans. To quote again from Mr. Talbot's book: "The practice is to get the range as communicated by the aeroplane, to bring the artillery into position speedily, to discharge salvo after salvo with all speed for a few minutes, and then to wheel the artillery away before any hostile fire can be returned. The celerity with which the British artillery comes into and goes out of action has astonished even our own authorities. The mobility is of unique value: it is taking advantage of a somewhat slow-witted enemy with interest. By the time the Germans have opened fire upon the point whence the British guns were discharged, the latter have disappeared, and are ready to let fly from another point, some distance away, so that the hostile fire is abortive. Mobility of such a character is decidedly unnerving and baffling even to a quick-witted opponent."

The only means of baffling the searching eyes of airmen has been the invention of ingenious tricks and ruses by which they may be misled, such as the making of dummy trenches. These are very difficult to distinguish from the real ones, as in the latter the occupants are hidden. Another trick is the concealment of guns by branches of trees. The branches also afford protection for the artillery men, who hide beneath them until the aeroplane has gone by. The illusion is made still more perfect by the fashioning of dummy guns from the trunks of trees. Such dummy artillery are frequently subjected to severe bombardment.

A story is told of a French airman who thought he observed the German outermost trenches to be teeming with men, whose helmets were distinctly visible. When the airman repeated his observation the trench was subjected to a terrific fire. But it was a waste of effort and munition, for the trench was filled merely with dummy soldiers crowned with helmets. While the

in the Present War

French were blowing into pieces the effigies of soldiers the Germans were withdrawing in safety to another position.

3. OFFENSIVE OPERATIONS

(1) *As Fighting Machines*

As has been mentioned, it was the vigorous use of the aeroplane for directing artillery fire as displayed by the Germans which roused the British aeroplanists to extend the rôle of the aeroplane in the war by making it a fighting machine. But, as is pointed out in Messrs. Grahame White and Harper's book, at the beginning of the war there was no machine available which could be called a fighting machine, and sheer necessity has been slowly evolving this type of machine as the war progresses. But at the beginning of the war, without machines powerfully armoured or armed, the British airmen gained an ascendancy in offensive operations which was truly remarkable. They made the very best of two qualities their machines possessed—speed and climbing power, and in the absence of machine guns supplemented these qualities with the plucky and effective use of revolvers or rifles, using them with deadly effect on the enemy airmen when climbing power had given them the advantage of the higher position. Later on in the war powerfully engined biplanes were armed with machine guns, which gave an attacking airman a far greater advantage, and such machines have become far more necessary since the Germans have seen the necessity of the use of fighting aircraft to prevent themselves being driven out of the air altogether.

The problem of the fighting aeroplane is perhaps the most difficult one that the aeronautical engineer has ever had to face. It should combine speed and climbing power with weight-carrying capacities, so that it can be adequately armoured and carry sufficiently powerful weapons, and it should possess stability.

But the armouring and arming opposes the vital qualities of speed and climbing power, and the question

The Use of Aircraft

arises which in a fighting machine are to be sacrificed to the other? Colonel W. S. Branker, the Deputy Director of Military Aeronautics, at a recent meeting of the Aeronautical Society of Great Britain, thus spoke of the difficulties of reconciling weight-carrying properties with those of rapid climbing.

"Many points of aerodynamical interest have been brought out by the war of which I cannot speak now; the most interesting is, perhaps, the conflict between the necessity of carrying weight and the desirability of a rapid climb. The development of fighting in the air makes great demands in weight-carrying qualities; practically every machine which takes the air now is equipped with some form of offensive firearm, or with bombs, over and beyond the endless accessories such as field glasses, cameras, wireless instruments, etc., and naturally the 'pusher' type, which was the type that Wilbur Wright evolved, although comparatively slower, has proved its superiority for the use of weapons. Armour is also necessary to ward off the splinters of the anti-aircraft shell. At the same time speed, climb, and easy handling must be retained if the pilot is to have a fair chance of accounting for his enemy.

"In spite of the demands of war for standardisation and rapid output, we are still developing and improving the aerodynamical qualities of the British aeroplane; as the war goes on the demands for speed, climb, and lift will become more and more exacting."

There can be no doubt that for a fighting machine the screw should be behind, so as to give unimpeded view in front. It is curious to note that the fact that the "pusher" type of machines are comparatively slower than the tractors, when the screw is in front, is in opposition to the opinions of the earlier pioneers of flying machines, who held that in a flying machine there is only one place for the screw—behind. Sir Hiram Maxim was most emphatic on this point. In his work *Artificial and Natural Flight* he says, "There is but one place for the screw, and that in the immediate wake.

in the Present War

While a machine is running, although there is a marked difference between water and air as far as skin friction is concerned, still the conditions are the same as far as the position of the screw is concerned. . . . good results can never be obtained by placing the screw in front instead of in the rear of the machines. If the screw is in front, the backwash strikes the machine and certainly has a decidedly retarding action."

Since tractor flying machines such as the Sopwith have proved to be a decided success, there could be no more striking example of the divergencies which arise between theory and practice!

Concerning the supposed speed of the new German fighting machines, it has been suggested it may be due to the new type of Mèrcèdes motor, which is said to combine efficiently light weight, high power, and reliability.

As has before been said, it is necessary at the present moment to draw the veil tightly over our own developments as to engines and other details; but we may reasonably expect that the engineering capabilities of the British nation will be more than equal to any developments as to speed, etc., which may surprise us in the flying craft of the enemy.

The following interesting remarks have lately appeared in *Flight* concerning the future of fighting aircraft:

"It is always unsafe to venture any prophecy, more so, perhaps, in aviation than in anything else, but it appears to us that the expansion tendency of the future will be towards the really large machine capable of carrying one or more fair-sized guns and large supplies of bombs. There is one fundamental factor which puts a limit to the size to which present types of biplanes can be built—namely, the fact that for the same form of construction, when linear dimensions are increased, the area grows as the square, and the weight as the cube. It would, therefore, seem that for the mammoth machines of the future a different form of construction will have to be employed, if the weight and loading

The Use of Aircraft

are to be kept normal. Here it appears to us that the most obvious line of development will lie along the multiplane form, either by superimposing the surfaces or by arranging them in tandem. Of these two alternatives the superimposed surfaces seem to us to offer the greatest possibilities, especially if taken in conjunction with multiple engines placed along the wings, so as to distribute the load more evenly over the entire surface."

If this prophecy should be fulfilled it will indeed be a tribute to the prevision of Wenham almost half a century ago!

(2) *As Bomb Carriers.*

It was also due to British enterprise that aeroplanes were first used in this war to make serious raids on points of military importance. The credit of these early raids fell to the Naval Wing of the Royal Flying Corps. Their first objectives were the Zeppelin sheds—a wise choice, indeed, as the mammoth Zeppelins were destined later to harass our coasts. The performances of the naval airmen which ended with the destruction of two Zeppelins have been graphically described in the daily papers; as also the seaplane attacks on Cuxhaven, and the subsequent great raids on the Belgian coast in February, 1915, when on February 11 thirty-four aeroplanes took part in the attack, and a few days later forty-eight (eight French). These memorable flights called for the greatest heroism of the naval airmen. To drop their bombs with destructive effect they had to fly down very low over the sheds and other points bombarded, and thus courted extreme peril because of the terrific gunfire that sometimes had to be faced.

Experience has shown that for bomb-carrying machines a fairly large size is desirable. By means of large and strongly-built aeroplanes the French have been able to execute a vast amount of aerial bombardment. Railroads have been uprooted, trains demolished, bridges destroyed. In *Aircraft in the Great War* there is the following description of a French raid on railway trains:

in the Present War

"The leading biplane dived swiftly, discharging a bomb at the engine. The range was short, and the bomb fell true; the engine was hit. With a rent torn in its side and the sound of a shattering report it rolled sideways and crashed from the metals, dragging several trucks with it, and spreading a scene of ruin all around. Meanwhile the second biplane, also flying low, had dropped its two bombs on the permanent way, which was uprooted and flung in all directions. The third bombdropper, flying towards the second train, missed with his first bomb, but placed the other in the middle of a row of trucks, with the result that the train was set on fire."

Perhaps the most popular British bomb-dropping feat was the annihilation of the Zeppelin in Belgium by the late Flight Sub-Lieutenant Warneford, V.C., on a Morane "parasol monoplane." For the destruction of Zeppelins in mid-air the nation has looked to the aeroplane, and the realization of expectation brought widespread consolation.

The present war has invited comparison of the respective utility of the lighter than air and heavier than air craft. Most will agree that the aeroplane has carried off the palm. It must be admitted, however, that there are still opportunities of usefulness for the airship, for the very reason that it possesses some qualities as yet absent in the aeroplane. It is capable of variable speed, and can hover over a particular spot. Owing to its possible size it can perform long journeys, it can carry a fair amount of bombs for offensive operations, and it is capable of night expeditions with safety. It has, however, the overpowering disadvantage of being a fair-weather machine, whereas the aeroplane is now practically an all weather one.

The weather limitations of the airship as it is at present is a consolation to those who dread the visitations of Zeppelins. As has been seen, in calm settled weather the enemy can do some mischief with a Zeppelin. But in the past, even in peace, adverse weather has been

Use of Aircraft in Present War

the final doom of most of the specimens that have been constructed. Since the war broke out unfavourable meteorological conditions have sealed the fate of some of the Zeppelins which in the unholy desire of innocent victims have ventured too far from home. It is probable that the knowledge of the famous squalls of the North Sea has been responsible for a good deal of the prudence of the commanders of the Zeppelins, and will continue to restrict very extended enterprise. These possible sudden squalls are the best protection we have against the advent of the unwelcome visitors. According to Mr. Talbot, a commander of one of the Zeppelins has confessed "that in the North Sea the rain squalls are of tropical violence, while the vertical thrusts of air are such that no dirigible as yet constructed could ever hope to live in one."

ERIC STUART BRUCE

CATHOLICISM & INTERNATIONAL LAW

The Collected Papers of John Westlake on Public International Law. Edited by L. Oppenheim, M.A., LL.D. Cambridge: University Press.

“THE evil that men do lives after them, the good is oft interred with their bones,” as Shakespeare puts into the mouth of Marcus Antonius ; but Westlake has left behind him a writing, and the writing is not interred, is good, and is before us. The work is not exhaustive, it is not a complete treatise on International Law, it lacks the fullness of a work such as that of Wheaton or of Travers Twiss ; it is rather a treatise on treatises of other writers ; it is philosophical, theoretical and highly polished like its distinguished author. It is a descent into the deep waters of law and is of profound research. It is a book to be read rather by the cabinet jurist than by the lawyer who has to fight the battles of the world.

Few are its faults. We must, however, criticise *in limine* its title “Public International Law.” The word “Public” is a favourite expression with many authors, and so is the “Law of Nations.” The better expression is simply “International Law.” Public International Law suggests “Private”—a word which Westlake adopts, for he talks of “Private International Law.” We beg to differ. There is no “Private International Law.” The word slips glibly off the tongue, and there it ends. What Westlake means are the rights and remedies of parties in the domestic forum, especially when they are in any measure dependent upon or connected with foreign transactions. A contract may be valid by the laws of the country where it is made, but not so where it is sought to be enforced. In another country it may be prohibited, or *vice versa*, such as in matters concerning private persons, marriage, divorce, wills, successions, or

Catholicism and

judgments ; as distinguished from war, treaties, ambassadors, or territory, and such like, which Story, that great American jurist, properly designates as the " Conflict of Laws " foreign and domestic. Westlake is not alone, however, in his love of this anomalous phrase. Others before him, such as Fœlix, have used it and believed in it.

" It is most important," says Professor Holland, in his *Elements of Jurisprudence*, " that the topic which for the last forty years has been misdescribed as ' Private International Law,' this barbarous compound, should no longer be employed." Another criticism might be made with regard to the employment of the word " Law," but this error has become so inveterate, even among the best authors and reviewers, that it is hardly fair to enlarge on it. Strictly speaking, where there is no sanction there can be no Law. So-called " International Law " consists merely of rules of agreement.

Westlake endeavours to define how International Law comes to be. Every writer on International Law has his own pet theory, his own opinion, but in the end the varied opinions meet in the conclusion that, whatever its origin, it consists of rules of conduct existing between civilised nations. Westlake leads us to consider the *jus gentium*, the writers of the Renaissance, and those three great works on the Laws of War by Ayala, *De Jure et officiis bellicis et disciplina militari* ; by Albericus Gentilis, *De Jure Belli* ; and by Hugo Grotius, *De Jure Belli ac Pacis* ; also the writings of Puffendorf, *De Jure Naturæ et Gentium* ; of Bynkershoek, *Questionum Juris Publici* ; of Wolffius, *Jus Gentium* ; and of Vattel, *Le Droit des Gens*. Other writers on International Law have done the same, and have introduced us to a larger crowd of International lawyers, some agreeing, some differing. But, as we have before observed, for the philosophic student Westlake has done wisely in concentrating his information on the very valuable works above-mentioned. The most interesting portion of his volume is not his dissertation on the Law of Nations, but his *Miscellaneous Papers* concerning a number of public questions, ranging

International Law

from 1856 to 1913, entirely beyond the ambit of ordinary writers on International Law. These Papers appeared sometimes in the *Times* newspaper, but oftener were read before some learned Society. Among them we smile to notice a Paper on the "Relations between Public and Private International Law," but apart from that, a Paper of considerable merit is that reprinted by permission from the *Law Quarterly Review* on "Continuous Voyages" and on "Contraband." Cognate to that is the famous incident of the *Trent*, which nearly plunged this country into war with the United States in 1861. The *Trent* left Havana for St. Thomas with Her Majesty's mails for England, having on board numerous passengers. Shortly after noon a steamer, being the *San Jacinto*, under the command of Captain Wilkes, stopped the *Trent*, and arrested Messrs. Mason and Slidell, who were public agents of the Confederate States on their way to Great Britain and France, bearing credentials. The good sense of both Governments prevented war, and the agents were eventually released; the learned arguments between the two countries conclude in proving that the envoy of an enemy is not contraband. But it must be admitted that this conclusion comes perilously close to the case of the *Orozembo*, decided in 1807.

It is wonderful to consider how the numerous propositions of International Law, discussed at the present day, have their nucleus in the true Law of Nature. No human society can have existed a day without some law, and a breach of such law must have caused a wrong to the person subject to it. We can suppose two tribes entering into agreement to divide a territory between them, such as is recorded in Genesis between Abram and Lot. Abram said to Lot, "Let there be no strife; is not the whole land before thee? Separate thyself, I pray thee, from me; if thou wilt take the left hand, then I will go to the right; or if thou depart to the right hand, then I will go to the left"; and, similarly, an invasion of a territory occupied by a tribe would by

Catholicism and

the merest principle of the Law of Nature instigate the occupying tribe to repel the invasion. Truly Wordsworth, meditating on the grave of Rob Roy, sang :—

. . . . the good old rule,
Sufficeth them, the simple plan,
That they should take who have the power,
And they should keep who can.

Or again, an agreement, formulated or tacit, can easily be imagined, of two tribes occupying opposite banks of a river ; neither of them for peace sake is to fish on the opposite bank. Indeed, these examples might be multiplied *ad infinitum*, and may be discovered at the root of every primitive legislation. Grotius distinguishes the Law of Nations from the Natural Law by the different nature of its origin and obligation, which he attributes to the general consent of nations. When many minds of different ages and countries concur in the same sentiment it must be referred to some general cause. This cause must either be a just deduction from the principles of natural justice or of universal consent. "The first," he says, "discovers to us the Natural Law, the second, the Law of Nations," and this second he terms *Jus Gentium*.

The expression *jus gentium* has caused much confusion, being employed with different meanings. The Romans governed their citizens by the *jus civile* from the establishment of the Republic to the subjugation of Central and Southern Italy. But towards the latter half of the Republic commerce increased in Rome, and naturally attracted merchants and strangers from all parts of the known world. To put it very shortly, the *jus civile* did not apply to the foreign element, unless to members of some allied State. Little by little the *jus gentium* was developed, partly by analogy to the *jus civile*, partly by other means, to provide laws for the traders and strangers. Thus it was truly *jus gentium*, law of the peoples, as distinguished from the more re-

International Law

stricted law for the Roman citizens, the *jus civile*. Originally a body of rules employed for the purposes of war, it may in very early days have been termed by the Romans *jus gentium*. But this is not to our purpose. The Emperor Justinian in the first Book of the Institutes distinguishes Natural Law from Civil Law and the Law of Nations. "Natural Law," says he, "is what Nature teaches to all animals, human or not," and he proceeds to point out that Civil Law is distinguished from the Law of Nations and that this is what all people who are governed by laws and customs make use of, partly of their own accord, partly by the common law of all men. Whatever a particular people has erected into law, that is the law of the particular city (*civitatis*), and is called the Civil Law, being the particular law of that city. But what natural reason has constituted between all men, that is observed equally by all, and is called the Law of Nations (*jus gentium*) because all nations make use of it. Suarez, that eminent Spanish Jesuit, refers to this in his second book, *De Lege Æterna et Naturali ac jure gentium*, and adds that *jus gentium* has a great affinity with Natural Law, and therefore is confused with it by many. The Romans early incorporated in their legislation the principles of the nautical code of the Greeks, and as their commerce and intercourse with other nations increased these laws became more liberal and general in their character and provisions. Many fragments of these old laws may be traced in the Code Theodosian (A.D. 429), in the Digest, Code, and Pandects (A.D. 528-533), and in the Basilicæ, and the Maritime Constitutions promulgated by the Emperor Leon. It cannot be too strongly insisted that *jus gentium* is not "International Law." Nevertheless, *jus gentium* played a large part in forming International Law, and is interwoven in the laws of various countries. Even after the fall of the Roman Empire it continued to be a part of them.

The Roman Law then was universally received as the expression of common sense and reason, and by lawyers was cultivated as the source of legal wisdom, and its

Catholicism and

influence passed on from land to land. The necessity of some common system of law to settle disputes which might arise during intercourse between State and State, large and powerful towns coming into existence, was felt. An appeal to the law was made, and was met by resorting to the great Roman Law embodied in the Code or Digest. It was on the restoration of the Western Empire under Charlemagne that the study of this law, which is now better known as the Civil Law, was completely revived, while the reduction of the Canon Law into a Code by Pope Gregory IX served to guide the decisions of the Church, and was largely founded on the Civil Law. Indeed, Civil Law was more universally known and studied in England in earlier days than now. The judges and professors of the Common Law of England had frequent recourse to it in cases where the Common Law was either silent or defective. Bracton, Fleta, and some of the most ancient books of the Common Law contain passages from the Institutes of Justinian, while many of the earlier judges have quoted the Civil Law as a foundation of a judgment; this, Selden, in his dissertation on Fleta, has clearly demonstrated. Besides the general advantages which have been reaped from the study of the Civil Law, it was not foreign to the jurisprudence of our own Kingdom.

We are apt to forget that the greater part of this island was governed by the Civil Law for a space of three hundred and sixty years, from the reign of the Emperor Claudius to that of Honorius, during which time some of the most eminent of the Roman lawyers, Æmilius Papinianus, Julius Paulus, and Domitius Ulpianus, sat in the seat of judgment here in England and rendered justice to the inhabitants. Papinian was *advocatus fisci* during the reign of Marcus, and *libellorum magister*, and later *prefectus pretorio* under Septimius Severus, whom he followed into Britain. Both Paulus and Ulpian were assessors to Papinian, "*Papiniano in consilio fuerunt*,"* says Spartianus, one of the six *Scriptores*

* *Pescen. Niger* 7.

International Law

Historiæ Augustæ. It is very probable that among other places they sat at York, A.D. 210. Their opinions and decisions are collected in the body of the Civil Law. The so-called *Leges Henrici Primi*, probably written in the early part of the reign of Henry II, contain many extracts from the Theodosian Code. Vacarius, a Lombard jurist, established a School of Civil Law at Oxford, and wrote his *Summa*, consisting of extracts from the Digest and the Code.

Even in later days, and almost in our own time, certain Courts proceeded according to the rules and forms of the Civil Law. Thus, in the High Court of Admiralty and in the many Courts of Vice-Admirals of the Coast of Great Britain and Ireland, cognizance of several matters civil and maritime was decided according to the Civil Law and the Maritime Customs. So in the Court of Chivalry, the Lord High Constable, when appointed temporarily *ad hoc*, and always the Earl Marshal, as judges, jointly or severally, of that Court, proceeded according to the Civil Law. Again, all the Ecclesiastical Courts of this Kingdom depended in part on the Civil Law, since the Canon Law, the foundation of their proceedings, was in great measure founded on it, and interwoven with its many branches. Thus it is not easy for a Canonist to understand the Canon Law aright, without being well versed in the Civil Law, which serves not only to explain the Canon Law, but in the practice of Ecclesiastical Courts is allowed to come in aid and supply the Canon Law where necessary. This appears plainly from the Commentaries of Dr. Lyndwood on the Provincial Constitutions of Canterbury, and of John of Athon on the Legatine Constitutions for the discipline of the Church of England.

As to what concerns the outward policy of the State, that is the intercourse which one State must have with others, knowledge of the Civil Law is of singular use in all transactions. The Civil Law has always been held in great esteem and veneration among all nations and has become the rule, as we have before mentioned, in all

Catholicism and

cases not expressly provided for by particular Municipal Laws. Therefore it is that nations have employed the rudiments of Civil Law in negotiations with foreign Courts, in treaties of peace and commerce, and in other intercourse under International Law. The adoption of the system of jurisprudence inculcated by the study of the Roman Law among different nations led little by little from what was inchoate in its origin to a law of consent. It was no longer *jus gentium*, a law imposed by Rome on strangers, but was *jus inter gentes*, a law agreed to by all, undertaken by all, and willingly subscribed to by all for their common good. It was Bentham who first invented the term *International Law* about 1790, but Zouch was the first to distinguish between *jus gentium* and *jus inter gentes*. Zouch was an Englishman, born in 1590, and not only judge of the High Court of Admiralty, but also professor of Roman Law at Oxford. The term International Law, or *jus inter gentes*, better expresses the jurisprudence we are dealing with than the older expression the *Law of Nations*, a denomination uncharacteristic, which has but the force of custom to support its claim.

The great writers quoted by Westlake, but especially Grotius, are (in conjunction with the changed principles of nations, caused by the fall of the Roman Empire) the founders of modern International Law, from whom, as in a fast descending stream, writer after writer has contributed his unit to swell the torrent. Thus we are at the present day. International Law, being but a consensus of States—for all States in its eye are equal—there is no master. *Quis custodiet custodes?* In other words, there is no sanction. Hence it is, should a nation, as in the present case of Germany, refuse to stand by its promises, to respect its treaties, or to fulfil its obligations, there exists in the eye of International Law no force to compel it. In every nation its ruler, whether King or President, supported by the voice of the people, causes individuals of that nation to obey its laws, the sanction being the fine, the prison, or the scaffold, but barring

International Law

the code of honour there remains for International Law no sanction but the voice of conscience. The practice respecting warfare has gradually been mitigated from being cruel and without any rule. The influence of Christianity as well as the courtesy of chivalry has done much for good. In later days the Declaration of St. Petersburg, 1868, renounced the use in time of war of explosive projectiles under 400 grammes weight. Again, two Declarations of the Powers, represented at the International Peace Conference at the Hague in 1899, agreed to abstain from the use of bullets which expand or flatten easily in the human body, and from projectiles the sole object of which is the diffusion of asphyxiating or deleterious gases. Again, in 1906, the Geneva Convention for the amelioration of the condition of the wounded and sick in armies in the field, was entered into.* Once again, in 1907, International Conventions signed at the Hague endeavoured to provide rules to diminish the evils of war so far as military requirements permit, and to serve as a general rule of conduct for the belligerents in their mutual relations, and in their relations with the inhabitants of those countries; also relative to the opening of hostilities, concerning the laws and customs of war on land, and respecting the rights and duties of neutral Powers and persons in war on land. The Conventions extended to forbid the bombardment of undefended ports, towns or buildings by naval forces, and at the same time the contracting parties agreed to prohibit until a third Peace Conference should be held (which has not yet occurred) the discharge of projectiles and explosives from balloons or by other new methods of a similar nature.† It would

* The Declaration of London, 1909, embodies a code of law designed for an International Prize Court, but it has not been ratified by Great Britain. We have, however, adopted generally during the present war the rules of this Declaration, subject to certain additions which are indispensable to the conduct of naval operations.

† This declaration has not been ratified by Germany, Austria, Turkey, or Bulgaria, nor on the other hand by France, Russia, Italy, Belgium, or Servia.

Catholicism and

exceed the limits of this review to enlarge on the other declarations formulated at this Conference. Suffice it to say that it called the attention of the Signatory Powers to the proposal for the creation of a "judicial Arbitration Court," and that in case of war the responsible authorities, civil as well as military, should make it their special duty to ensure the maintenance of pacific relations, more especially the commercial and industrial, between the inhabitants of the belligerent States and neutral countries. Thus the Conference called the attention of the Signatory Powers to the advisability of creating a "Judicial Arbitration Court." It doubtless desired to obtain a sanction for enforcing the various Conventions. What more could be expected of it? However well defined the International Court may be, and how great and excellent may be its rules, it is always open, as unhappily we know of late, for any one Power to tear up the "Scrap of Paper." When honour fails one sanction alone remains, a sanction which is above all human institutions and all human laws. It is the voice of conscience, with the terrible sanction of eternity for those who believe.

This has been too much forgotten in modern days, although the primitive nations, pagan though they, with one exception, were, respected the rules of war and obligations of treaties as a religious duty. The inviolability of ambassadors and heralds was consecrated under similar religious principles. Treaties had for their sanction solemn oaths, the violation of which was believed to be followed by the vengeance of the gods. Before the Greeks engaged in war it was usual to publish a declaration of the injuries they had received, and to demand satisfaction by ambassadors; for, however prepared or excellently skilled in the affairs of war they were, yet it was thought that peace, if to be procured upon honourable terms, was the more eligible. This custom was observed even in the most early ages, as appears from the story of Tydeus; Polynices sent to compose matters with his brother Eteocles, King of

International Law

Thebes, before he proceeded to invest that city. So we are informed by Statius:*

*... Potior cunctis sedit sententia, fratris
Præsentare fidem, tutosque in regna precando
Explorare aditus: Audax ea numera Tydeus
Sponte subit.*

Ambassadors were usually persons of great worth or eminence, that they might command respect and attention from their enemies, and, whatever injuries or affronts might have been committed by the other country, yet ambassadors were held sacred by all. Gods and men were thought to be concerned to prosecute with the utmost vengeance any injuries done to them. They were under the care and protection of Mercury and of Jupiter, whence Achilles calls them messengers, not of men only, but of Jupiter. Ambassadors were employed in formulating treaties and in bringing about agreements between countries. Heralds were sent to declare war. A herald declared war by bidding the people who had provoked it to prepare for an invasion, and sometimes in token of defiance cast a spear towards them. This was rarely done without seeking the advice of the gods. The soothsayers were consulted, the oracles also, and no labour spared to propitiate Heaven for assistance. Sacrifices were offered and generous vows made for the success of the enterprise. Similar practices existed in Rome, Persia, and other places.

So much for the Pagans. Among the Jews, as can easily be conceived, the same trust in the Almighty Power prevailed. This further appears from the well-known vow of Jephtha, when he undertook to fight for Israel against the Ammonites. The history of the Jews, as we notice, both from the Old Testament and the writings of Josephus, affords abundant information relating to their rules of war. Moses ordered that when

* *Thebais*, Lib. II., v. 368.

Catholicism and

they were about to go to war they should send ambassadors and heralds to their enemies, it being right to make use of words before coming to weapons of war, and thereby to assure their enemies that, although they had a numerous army and a merciful God ready to assist, they did not nevertheless desire to fight nor to take possessions which would be for their advantage, but which they did not desire to take if their enemies hearkened to them and kept peace. Selden, *De Jure Naturali et Gentium juxta disciplinam Ebraeorum*, gives numerous examples of the religious conduct of the Jewish people in observing the laws of war.

At the Hague Conference the Pope was not permitted to send an envoy, or other representative, on the ground it would appear that he was not a temporal Sovereign. Whether this exclusion was unfortunate is doubtful. The envoy, even had his voice prevailed over all other representatives, which is most improbable, could only have formulated principles on a temporal basis. This is not what is required in these days, when religion is little respected by many. A something more is needed, that is to say, a Declaration from the Papal Chair defining *ex cathedra* the Christian principles of warfare. The late Mr. David Urquhart, an ardent politician, and Member of Parliament for Stamford, very properly suggested, in 1868, on the occasion of the meeting of the Vatican Council, that a remedy for all the evils of modern society would be found in causing the penetration into the minds of Christian nations the conviction that the intercourse between State and State should be governed by the moral law, as much as, and still more than, the intercourse between one individual and another. He suggested that the Commandments which forbid to kill, to steal, or to covet the goods of another, relate as much to the theft of a province as to the theft of a piece of money, and that the destruction of a large army, in an unjust war, was as wrong as the murder of a private person. He asks who will restore this moral sense to Christian nations, and bring again the influence of the

International Law

commands of God, and of the first principles of equity, into international relations. Mr. Urquhart turns towards the Catholic Church, saying, "You alone have the power. The Catholic Church alone has a voice powerful enough to make itself heard to the extremities of the globe." He thinks that the Church unites all the qualities which are desirable for the exercise of this universal magistracy, that she has no need of soldiers, the sword of the Word suffices for her.

The question at once arises, "What is an unjust war?" A war which is manifestly unjust. But the universal blindness of each State in seeing itself furnishes it with the excuse that the injustice is not manifest. Nothing is manifest for those who will not see. The task for the Church to-day is to establish rules whereby a ruler may clearly see when he sheds innocent blood. War is only permissible when satisfaction has been sought and is refused. War ought always to be the final remedy to heal wounds caused by injustice. St. Augustine points out that the desire of a State should always incline towards peace, and that stern necessity alone should cause war. The draft of a Decree which was circulated at Rome at the time of the Vatican Council, but was not formally placed before it, excludes certain cases from being consistent with a just war, and continues by pointing out that in all such cases a Christian cannot take part in hostilities without incurring mortal sin; for he may not obey orders which would oblige him to violate those rules, it being only when rulers command what is just and right that they should be obeyed, for, it concludes, "it is necessary to obey God rather than man." So thought St. Maurice and his companions when in A.D. 286 he, in command of the Thebean Legion, was sent by the Emperor Diocletian out of the East to compose his army for the expedition into Gaul. At Martignac, Maximilian, the general, ordered the whole army to offer sacrifices to the gods for the success of the expedition. The Thebean Legion refused, whereupon the Emperor ordered it to be decimated. After the

Catholicism and

first decimation a second was commanded, unless the legion obeyed the above orders, but they refused, and, encouraged by St. Maurice, all were slain. They dropped their arms, and were butchered like sheep. Thus it is not mere human commands which oblige in war. In this, the twentieth century, a man is disposed to consider too much the commands of Princes, to the derogation of his own conscience. All power is from God, says St. Paul, and subjects should obey all lawful commands. Sometimes it is most difficult to know whether a command be lawful or not. Similarly, it has been difficult, even for saints, to differentiate their obedience between Pope and anti-Pope. Much of the evil of the English Reformation, so-called, consisted in the fact of the Archbishop of Canterbury being *Legatus Natus*, issuing dispensations in the name of the Pope, and subsequently the same man issuing the same things by virtue of an Act of Parliament.

The whole theory of war has completely changed, and we agree with Mr. Urquhart that now above all other times is the time for the Supreme Pontiff of the Church to define without any possibility of mistake the rights of mankind, rulers towards their subjects, soldiers towards their rulers, and enemies towards their foes. In the primitive days, when a chief led his tribe to battle, himself the foremost in the ranks and exposed to all hazards, a battle was honest, bravely fought, man opposed to man with fists, with clubs, later with swords and lances. It is the invention of machines of war, from Archimedes downwards, which, culminating at this day in poisonous gas, liquid fire, and cannon which carry for miles and slay an unseen adversary by an unconscious gunner, detract from the honest fight. It is a fight not of men, but of machines. The Viking or the chief no longer leads the battle. His successors, the politicians and rulers of the State, compose themselves snugly in Parliament, in the Reichstag, in the Council Chamber, or on the political platform. They are safe from the foe. So also is their purse safe from the

International Law

vectigalia. Cæsar cannot render tribute to himself, but he is liable to render to his God a long account of lives slain and of property wasted.

Little do such rulers personally reckon of the terrors of war. It is often waged for their purely selfish reasons, lust of dominion, or angry jealousy. Sometimes even for more unworthy motives. How truly Byron wrote :

Trust not for freedom to the Franks,
They have a King who buys and sells.

Patriotism is excellent in itself, it is a virtue. "Patriotism," says Cardinal Mercier, in his pastoral letter of Christmas, 1914* :—

the internal principle of unity and of order, organic bond of the members of the same country, was looked upon by the best of thinkers of ancient Greece and Rome as the highest of all natural virtues.

But the rights of the people should be considered ; often under the mask of necessity, but for some occult, unworthy end, innocent lives are destroyed. Every man by the law of nature has a right to his life. Oftentimes it is all he has. It is tyranny to take it from him by war unjust, or frivolous pretence. It is here that religion properly steps in, and, as the Church has protected the slave from the injustice of his master in ages past, so now surely is a fitting occasion for a Papal pronouncement on the rights of subjects and of their modern rulers. None but a prophet can say when the present war will end. We shall find on the morrow of the Declaration of Peace a changed world. Most of our men will be or have been in the Army or Navy, they will have seen life in a strange light, and the world will have a wider place for them. Old conditions will have gone,

* " Le patriotisme, principe interne d'unité et d'ordre, liason organique des membres d'une même patrie, était regardé par l'élite des penseurs de la Grèce et de la Rome antiques, comme la plus haute des vertus naturelles."

Catholicism

years of scarcity will follow. It should be for the Papacy, the sole unbiassed Power, to endeavour to rebuild the shattered world in a manner worthy of the noble dead. Doubtless the august Pontiff will have already considered the expediency of now beginning the preparation of his Christian task. It is idle for men to say that he is not an arbitrator, that an arbitrator should be appointed by those between whom he is asked to decide, and that the Pontiff has not been asked so to do. Such might be said to the President of the United States or to the King of Spain. Here there is no question of arbitration. The Pope does not need to be asked. It is for him to dictate. By virtue of his office, it is for him to point out, whether rulers like it or not, what is right and what is wrong.

GEO. SHERSTON BAKER.

THE GIFFORD LECTURES OF MR BALFOUR

ONE passage in Mr. Balfour's able work seems satisfactorily to give the gist of his contention, and to give it unaffected by any side issues which he raises. His words are :—

If the most we can say for morality is that it is the product of non-moral, and ultimately of material agents, guided up to a certain point by (natural) selection, and thereafter left to the sport of chance, a sense of humour, if nothing else, should prevent us wasting fine language on the splendour of the moral law, and the reverential obedience owed to it by mankind. That debt will no longer be paid to it if morality comes to be generally regarded as the effect of petty causes ; comparable in its lowest manifestations to the appetites and terrors which rule for their good the animal creation ; in its highest phases no more than a personal accomplishment, to be acquired or neglected at the bidding of individual caprice. More than this is needed if the noblest ideals are not to lose the power of appeal. *Ethics must have its roots in the Divine, and in the Divine it must find its consummation* (pp. 128-9).

These last words we underline as most vital ; for they explain in brief the title of the volume, *Theism and Humanism*, that is, Theism the informing spirit of life needed by otherwise dead humanism. To defend such a proposition lies within the terms laid down by the founder of the Gifford Lectures, namely, that they should be in defence of natural religion. Incidentally a large number of topics are touched upon in the successive lectures, so many that the author speaks of them as seemingly "a bewildering variety" (p. 247), including Art, History, Morals, The Theory of Probability, The Logic of Perception, The Presuppositions of Science, which are "introduced one after another with a breathless rapidity" ; yet he claims continuity of purpose, and that purpose is the one which Lord Gifford prescribed as the condition of his bequests to four Scottish Universities.

The Gifford Lectures of

The limits of this REVIEW make it desirable to dwell mainly on a single point which is the most important in the subject. As Mr. Mallock takes the principle that life is worth living to validate Theistic ethics, Mr. Balfour takes the common-sense estimate of the dignity proper to morality as a ground of argument. "My main contention rests," he says, "not upon the difficulty of humanising moral ends in a godless universe, but upon the difficulty of maintaining moral values if the moral origins are purely naturalistic."

Thus he claims to introduce God as source of highest and alone-satisfying worth for Ethics. While by the terms of the lectureship he cannot speak about the grace of God, he is authorized to say a little in relation to the true remark of St. Augustine, that we cannot have solid hope for human affairs if we leave out the action of Divine Providence. In this connexion we read (pp. 266-7): "The categories required for the point of view are Providence and Inspiration," which are here understood, not in regard to God as Metaphysical or Absolute, but "as the Humanistic side of Theism." So viewed, Providence signifies "Divine guidance, the purposeful working of an informing Spirit," while "Inspiration suggests it in the narrower sphere of belief and emotion." One bar to our saying what apart from Divine assistance, human nature can know and do is the fact that we experimentally have always lived under the help of God's grace and in the light shed by His Church. In the hypothetical case of man living under the natural order of Providence, St. Thomas implies (*Contra Gent.*, I., 4) that then, for the race at large, if its natural conditions were what they are at present, there would be some exigence of Divine communications given to supply defects arising from individual incapacities and from unfavourable environment. Such aid would not be strictly "supernatural," for it would be the requirement of mankind as God made the race with its circumstances; and He always is responsive to natural requirement, even on the side of inevitable deficiencies. The acceptance of Providence involves that much. An important point is

Mr Balfour

to be noticed, that God as the Object of human research is not like the scientific objects of the material universe, which lend no moral aid by self-manifestation, while God is a responsive Personality in closest contact with the inquirers, caring for their perplexities, and ready to reveal Himself according to the exigencies of their situations. St. Thomas further says that it is more honourable to God and more true to fact if we suppose that He has given His creatures the powers themselves to do the actions proper to their kind. So far he agrees with the scientific axiom that the agents known to be at work are to be taken as doing it by their united efforts. Nevertheless Dr. Wallace's addition to the Darwinian theory is not unscientific when he supposes a supermundane intervention to account for a transition from infra-human to human. We should not be surprised if in the revelation to be made in the next world we found that, though the celestial bodies were like the terrestrial in constituents and kept terrestrial laws, yet an angelic guidance of them was also part of their full account. Often our knowledge of material causes and effects in large areas is not so complete that we can positively deny the need of an extra-physical causality, or of a Providential assistance.

At the same time we leave such possibilities out of scientific books, not multiplying causes without a reasonable ground. But in the realm above physics, in the region of man's ethical and religious duties, our merely natural philosophy of Morality and Theology may well be regarded as requiring to be supplemented in practice by divine interventions, such as are proper to the provident Ruler of His own universe. At any rate Theism, which denies the Deistic idea of a world made by God and then abandoned exclusively to its own workings, inclines us towards the belief that in the order of Nature there are certain dependencies of man upon God's immediately intervening action—dependencies less than those in the order of grace, and yet very real and befitting for the condition of a creature. So much having been

The Gifford Lectures of

said on this point, we may now take up the part assignable to man himself in procuring his ethical and religious knowledge for himself, in which question Mr. Balfour has to touch on psychological and epistemological controversies.

Like Newman, Mr. Balfour disowns the intention of explaining formal argumentation. Both writers more or less agree not to go further than a "Grammar in Aid of a Grammar of Assent" and a description of how an "illative sense" works out conclusions in the concrete. About the verbal terms here we need not dispute: they are Newman's. Two differences, however, mark off the Cardinal: first, his religious beliefs are far more numerous and absolute; and secondly, a break in his mental history suggests a presumption that in his case it will not be easy to find maintained unity of expression or attitude. The test of this presumption by facts seems yet to be made. In his Oxford sermons he delivered his theory as he himself had elaborated it: but much later, in his *Grammar of Assent*, he repeated it, not without some modification from a study of the scholastic system and from a certain control of Dr. Meynell, which he himself solicited, as should be read in his biography, carefully detailed by Mr. Wilfrid Ward. Mr. Balfour's changes, if any, are of his own unbroken development: he does not republish his work on *Philosophic Doubt* and regrets to have been interpreted as having defended religion by the *tu quoque* argument against the other sciences: You are equally indefensible in ratiocination. He is like to Newman, however, in offering an easy task to the seekers after a double series of utterances, one for the believer and one for the sceptic. On the former side Mr. Balfour may be quoted as saying:—

The source of morality must be moral. The source of knowledge must be rational. . . . It will be urged that for all reasonable beings reason must be the Supreme Judge in matters of belief. It can neither resign its office nor delegate its authority. . . . I ask for nothing better than this advice, than the supremacy of reason: no one of its prerogatives do I wish to control (pp. 250-1).

Mr Balfour

For the other series we will give more than one specimen:—

Neither our æsthetic emotions nor our moral sentiments are the product of ratiocination; nor is it by ratiocination that they are likely to suffer essential wrong (p. 134).

I disown any intention of providing you with a philosophic system: I have none to recommend (p. 261).

The philosopher admits in theory no ground but reason. I recognize that in fact the whole human race, including the philosopher himself, lives by faith alone. The contents of the system are always reacting on its fundamental principles, so that no philosophy can flatter itself that it will not be altered out of all recognition as knowledge grows. This may look like a truism (p. 263).

Our beliefs are provisional: we cannot claim that they are good as far as they go: but only that they are as good as we are able to make them (p. 266).

Cardinal Newman would not have endorsed all these utterances *in globo*. Mr. Balfour himself, we believe, would not approve all that they naturally convey in normal speech. While in part he seems decidedly to be under some mistake, this probably is not as great as might be inferred on the common interpretation of his language.

Plato is most certainly inconsistent, but covertly under the shelter of different speakers in dialogues: Aristotle is openly inconsistent without a blush. In Christian literature some representatives held that what was true in faith might be false in reason and *vice versa*. Kant taught that the speculatively self-contradictory was in several cases practically true. At least Mr. Balfour labours under no radical disabilities of this sort: he is not like Kant and Hegel in their hopeless tangles.

Some extrication from his difficulties may be found if we notice the manner in which informal reasoning works. Every adult has a stored-up body of accepted principles and beliefs, more or less unified and habitually recognized according to his character for precision. If developed

The Gifford Lectures of

mentality is not, as Sensists say, only "worked-up sensations," yet it is most complexly worked-up thoughts, with or without conscious design. From this mental build, structure, or outfit man proceeds to make further accumulations. The fixed capital to which he seeks additions is sometimes called "the apperceptive centre" of the conscious self. Round this there goes on a process which, at least when reflexion is not attentive to it, may figuratively be styled mechanical and automatic. The meaning is that a question proposed, a new proposition offered for acceptance, a new perception needing to be classified, are treated in a manner which reminds us of physical attractions and repulsions in nature. What is congenial to the centre finds entrance without express care for examination or deliberation; what is uncongenial finds the door barred. The hurry of life often necessitates *Denkökonomie*. Frequently the free-and-easy method works very well: not rarely it of course works ill. One incident in reasoning that is informal makes it seem unreasonable. The special case may be introduced by some physical examples which are not parallel and yet may prepare the way to an understanding. The assistant in a scientific department once went running off to his chief, because he had taken a glass of water in his hand and suddenly there was solid ice. A shake may thus determine the sufficiently cold particles to freeze. Again, there seem to be a few authentic instances when a blow on the head has righted something which before was wrong in the brain. Now to take the thoughts in the brain: sometimes a conviction is almost wrought out, and then it may be clinched by a trifle—to outsiders, perhaps, an irrelevant trifle. The fact is illustrated by some converts who give an account of their religious change, for instance Lord Brampton: they just assign what is prominent in their own history, the ultimate determinant of a crisis which had a long brooding preparation. The fallacy of "one cause" in a compound productivity is well known: a part is put for the whole.

What are called the spontaneous, immediate "in-

Mr Balfour

tuitions" of the centre are in part as primitive and elemental as we can have them, and in part decidedly derivative and complex though they appear simple. The primitives are detectable by the test that they are not analysable into mere simple constituents and are from the start at least as immediate as our minds can have them in self-conscious possession. But the primitive intuitions are not simple inasmuch as in practical human knowledge, in the knowledge especially that is proper to those who have reached "the age of reason," no single idea or principle can be understood quite apart, standing like terms in a dictionary and propositions made up of subject, copula and predicate in an elementary grammar. He who really understands any one object or statement must understand some others as its needful setting. Next, as regards the more definitely derivative intuitions; they act immediately and have their own kind of indissoluble unity, analogous to the sense of a note, or a colour. To these may be accommodated what Aristotle says of happiness: It is not itself *kinesis* but the *telos* to which *kinesis* leads. They account for much that is put down to the credit of the *sub-conscious*: and in a mind highly advanced they act as wonderful illuminants having a simplicity and a spontaneous activity such as to make persons believe them due to quite a higher revelation. All these considerations bear upon informal reasoning and make it seem so much better than the formal reasoning, which must be partial, abstract and narrow-reaching. Nevertheless informal reasoning often needs supervision by the formal in a way which we will illustrate in Mr. Balfour's favourite field of illustration, namely Ethics.

We will begin by an exclusion; one class of problems we set quite aside, namely complex questions on morals which are not suited to Ethics as usually formalised in the general treatise. The philosophy of a subject is by nature a general treatment, which leaves details for special discussion. There is, for example, in *Applied Logic* a proposition that history of the past is one source of certitude: it deals with sceptical difficulties such as

The Gifford Lectures of

Mr. Balfour has thought of some weight in his *Philosophic Doubt*, and which are of the general character. It does not touch all or any of the knotty points which professors of history discuss *ad infinitum*. So in philosophic morals, where we find established clearly a great principle or rule by formal argument we cannot expect the same clearness from the formality always to penetrate the darker corners. It is not surprising that some who have in general condemned duelling with decisiveness have confessed a difficulty about making their arguments similarly forcible for some extreme cases of provoked duel which local custom demands to be accepted. The like is true of suicide, which can be formally proved to be wrong in general, but not so clearly in extreme distress or need. The puzzle of reprisals in war is to-day much exercising the ethical mind; it is far beyond the formality of general ethics. Here the arguments, especially in their formality, in their detachment from the "apperceptive centre" of the whole conscience, can be and have been plausibly attacked as not constraining. De Lugo admits this in words which might have been more guarded in view of miscellaneous readers. Mr. Balfour will take them as favouring his informal process, and they answer to Newman's expression about "surplusage of assent" over adduced evidences—a phrase adopted from Locke. The question under discussion is that of suicide.

Tota difficultas consistit in assignanda ratione hujus veritatis. Nam licet turpitudine haec statim appareat, non tamen facile est ejus fundamentum invenire. Unde quod in aliis multis questionibus contingit, magis certa est conclusio quam rationes quæ variæ a diversis offeruntur ad ejus probationem. (*De Justitia et Jure Disputatio*, X. sect. 1.)

Notice how de Lugo does not say that the process is "not ratiocinative," nor that it is like the animal instinct of the bee, whereby it "builds better than it knows" and meets emergencies which it does not intelligently analyse.

We go, therefore, to clear examples, such as alone are

Mr Balfour

used in *General Ethics*, in order that we may briefly indicate how a formal treatment proceeds without special faculty and by the ordinary judgment. Actions are specified or take their distinct kinds from their objects. The actions morally good will (*ceteris paribus*) be determined by morally good objects, the good being that which befits and often constrains the rational nature created by God. The leading object of an act is found by asking what has the man done. What substantially was his conduct in this case? How would you name it in brief? It is usual to add the incidental tests of circumstances and of side-motives, ends, purposes; but since all these are again judged by their several objects, we will confine ourselves to the main object which gives the name to the action: for example, he prayed, he blasphemed, he paid his debts, he stole, he vindicated the true cause, he lied and calumniated. The summary of the whole law is found in the Ten Commandments; and in every observance of them the ethically good is describable by the object of the action or omission, tested by its conformity to the exigencies of man's rational nature as such: *vivere convenienter naturæ*. Thus the acknowledgment of God as the One God, and the worship of Him; obedience to needful authority of parents; the regard for human life and limb; due provision for the multiplication of offspring within the bounds of marriage fidelity; due care of a neighbour's property and reputation; restraint of those desires which could not be carried into execution without the perversion of right order: here in simple guise is presented the system which is followed by those much-dreaded Ethics of Formal Philosophy in Catholic schools. To some it does seem a pity that science should be reached in such a common-sense way. Here are "value-judgments" positively brought down to the level of common discernment! In simplicity, "sweet reasonableness," and the avoidance of the preposterous, the contrast with Kant's clumsy and irrational apparatus is self-imposing on the attention.

The Gifford Lectures of

Why that formality is feared it is easy on one noteworthy ground to declare. Of the trite definition that man is a rational animal many parodies have been jocosely invented : to the list we may add this other : "Man is a lazy-minded animal." Especially he relucts against the bore and the bother of having painstakingly to put his thoughts precisely into shape, of having carefully to mark out what it is that has to be said on a subject, and what it is that must not be said. The repugnance is keenly felt by the undisciplined boy at school, who likes the rough-and-ready method of lucky shots, even though these are counter-balanced by what in cricket would be called "wides" and in the slang of the class-room "howlers."

Mr. Balfour does not follow Kant, but he may be indirectly under some of his baneful influence on the world concerning the repudiation of an objective science of Morality, as we understand the phrase. In general it may be protested that the good things which Kant is credited by his admirers with introducing, he at most reintroduced against impugners, and did so in a debased manner. For before Kant it was quite well understood that individual conscience could alone bring home to man his duty and present it as a categorical, absolute, universal imperative : that the good will must go with the good object, and would not lose its merit if the judgment had inculpably erred in reporting a bad object as good : that obedience to conscience is free, and free in a better sense than Kant allowed, who taught necessitation of the only deciding will that we really know in order to hand over liberty to the will we cannot know, for it is noumenal : that mere experience on the principles of the positivists cannot found an ethical value. On the bad side Kant upset the previously secured truth when he denied that the objects pursued contributed to the essence of morality being but external conditions, and when he excluded from morality also God and His Law. Modern admirers at least regret his saying that love for lovable persons because of their amiable qualities adulterates the morality

Mr Balfour

of reverence for the pure law without any contents. They may be boldly challenged to make good a single claim to an important discovery, whereas opponents may point out on almost every page assertions either unintelligible or erroneous.

Morality is reduced to ultimate dependence on a feeling—not the moral sense of other philosophers which Kant rejects as empirical—but an *a priori* sense of reverence for the autonomous law of conscience. He is aware how strange this will sound, and has to bolster up his position in a note which tells us that this is a unique sort of feeling—like the nigger who was “not a common black man.” Kant says, “It may be objected that I take refuge behind the word *Achtung*, *respect*, or *reverence*, in an obscure *feeling*, instead of giving a distinct solution by a concept of the reason.”* The objection is exceedingly fair; and in this way it is burked. “Although respect is a feeling, it is not a feeling received through outer influence (not pathological, he says elsewhere). The object of the respect is *law* only without contents, the law which we impose on ourselves as the result of our will. Moral interest consists simply in respect for the law.” “This feeling of reverence is *self-effected* (*selbstgewirktes*):” so it answers the requirement of autonomy. (*The Metaphysic of Morality*, Section I.) All this is finally a lapse into verbiage; it would not as it stands be acceptable to Mr. Balfour’s clear mind; yet it seems to have cast on him a shadow from the distance.

Religion on the like plan is reduced by Kant to a belief in God as presented to the mind, nobody can say how,

* “Concept of the reason” ought to point to something understood, but here with Kant it stands for the unknowable: his words are, *durch einen Begriff der Vernunft*. Now *Vernunft* is a protean word: one thing clearly said of it is, that it cannot know or assert its ideas of reality itself. It is said also to limit the extravagations of understanding (*Verstand*); to be a faculty of desire (*Begehrungs vermögen*): and to be practical but not speculative. Semple in his translation of Kant’s *Metaphysics of Ethics* quotes: “One of the greatest difficulties in the study of Kant’s *Practical Reason* is to determine how far he distinguishes Reason from Will” (p. 25).

The Gifford Lectures of

but not cognitively. For English readers who read too docilely and uncritically, a passage from the preface to *The Critique of Pure Reason* has been thus abbreviated: "In the human soul the will is free. There is no contradiction in supposing that the very same will in its acts as phenomena is not free but necessarily subject to the law of Nature, while yet as belonging to a thing in itself it is free." Here is supposed to be a true object of belief which to knowledge is rejectable as self-contradictory. Another instance is the God of religious belief. To this we proceed: "I have therefore found it necessary to deny *knowledge* of God, of freedom and of immortality, in order to find a place for faith." Mystics claim intuitions of what we reach indirectly from analogies; Kant says that perhaps no possible intellect could have intuitions of his noumena—so unintelligible are they; which is very condemnatory of the noumena. Here, as in other places, Kant has taken an old truth and turned it to confusion *more suo*. When old authors in the Christian Church used to call God "unknowable," they explained that they meant two things: more of Him was left unknown than was known; and on the known side the idea was not what was called a *species propria* derivable direct from the object itself, as is done in mystic vision, but immediately through human analogies, inferences, and removal of limits. Ulrici has improved on Kant's limiting idea by calling it a compound of knowledge and ignorance! Ein Grenzbegriff ist ein solches das von der einen Seite Wissen, von der andern als Nicht Wissen sich ausweist. This is an illustration of the scholastic axiom in regard to human limits in knowledge: *cognitum est in cognoscente secundum modum cognoscentis*, which Kant perverts into *secundum formas a priori non certo objectorum realium representativas*.

After these explanations we may without offence ask whether Mr. Balfour might not advantageously modify some of his depreciations of reason in favour of feeling and faith. In both matters his tendency seems somewhat Kantian in its recourse to the non-rational, if not to

Mr Balfour

the positively irrational. Kant in one place (*Kritik der Urtheilskraft Einleitung*, III), though elsewhere he suggests the possibility of ultimate oneness, made a bad differentiation of feeling as a third irreducible by the side of two others, understanding and will. In practice at least, apart from decisive settlement, it works better if we treat feeling as a quality, a character of action, not as a distinct kind of action. Then in the strictly intellectual order we find the cognitive and the appetitive faculties functioning with certain qualities of feeling. In the lower or animal order we have a parallel division. It is easy but deceptive to shift off upon uncriticizable feeling the office of supplying the supposed needs of criticizable reason. The subterfuge is part of a larger device which throws upon the sub-conscious aggregate the burden said to be not bearable by the conscious—a blind man's excuse for not seeing and yet giving testimony. Far better is it to keep feeling in its more or less identity with thought and volition. Also we may keep even thought and volition in more or less of identity at the root, in their mutual compenetration within one simple soul.*

* It is hard to say who first introduced a thing. Kant is reported to have had constantly open on his table the books of Tetens; and to Tetens the distinction of Feeling as a third faculty is attributed by Zeller, Stökle and Erdmann. With his usual confusion Kant puts also *Urtheilskraft* as the third member of the Trichotomy. But *Urtheilskraft* ought to go further than feeling, for it is that whereby we judge of purposes in Nature. Yet Erdmann calls it an accident that Kant did not style his *Urtheilskraft* Feeling, though as a faculty of judgment it ought to go beyond feeling. However, it is a judgment that asserts nothing of reality; it declares only our necessary mode of viewing reality. So it is like *Vernunft*. But poor *Vernunft* itself is not constant in its agnosticism. Starting with a distinction of knowing *Verstand* from not knowing *Vernunft* whose three great ideas are regulative but not constitutive, Kant's leading division of his *Kritik* is into *Vernunft* as speculative and *Vernunft* as practical. These vagaries are endless, and would disgust Mr. Balfour beyond expression. Kant is like Spencer in managing at times to know his Unknowable. On the strength of this inevitable inconsistency friends seek to defend him from scepticism and to rank him as substantially even a scholastic philosopher!

The Gifford Lectures of

Next to feeling, faith seems ill-described by Mr. Balfour on Kantian lines. Faith according to Kant accepts truths that are not couched in intelligible terms but in merely "regulative ideas"—strangely regulative without conveying knowledge—such as Self, Universe, God, and Freedom.* These cannot be asserted to answer as representative conceptions of the realities to which they are referred. We must say not objectively, "It is morally certain that there is a God," but subjectively, "I am morally certain that there is a God": not "Nature is teleological" but "we must regard Nature as teleological." Thus a sad and sceptical confusion is introduced into faith with the stultification of reason. Does Mr. Balfour accept this in claiming for belief what knowledge fails to give? When Kant is glorified for this distinction it reminds us, though it is a much milder example, of the glory given to Nietzsche, at least before the German war, not for his denial of moral worth, but just for a nuance of truth—the need to create our own values in this poor world, and to be powerful enough to do this in face of the gentle virtues which put up with things bad. A grain of truth is buried in a mountain of falsehood.

Next, Mr. Balfour does not well in conjecturing that our moral system may grow out of all present power of recognition in future developments. Man is specifically a constant. He has definitely a substantial nature which is fixed. The Darwinian Descent of Man is not acceptable as true. Man's primitive morality is to be known, not from ill-supported inference, nor from a hypothetical derivation through animal conduct, to which origin we are to see our nearest possible approach humanly in the supposed "primitives." Savages are thus taken as at least our best approximations to primitive man, even though in fact they be far higher, on the Darwinian

* In Kant's *Logic* we read: "Glaube ist Fürwahrhalten aus einem Grunde der zwar objectiv unzureichend, aber subjectiv zureichend ist." These words he repeats in his *Critique of Judgment*.

Mr Balfour

hypothesis. No savages that we can know come near in antiquity to the evidently ethical records of the Bible, or of India, China, Egypt, Assyria and Babylon. These are explicit and sure sources ; opponents rely on conjectures risky and exclusive of a Creator.

For the theory so far criticized, St. Thomas offers us a reasonable substitute. He starts from no inadequate grounds, such as a blind feeling, which has to develop itself into thought and will ; or a will at first without represented objects, but gradually reaching them—which is *panthelism* : or an idea which unfolds itself into reality—which is *panlogism* : or again, atoms that combine endlessly and produce all material kinds and all thought. He begins with human nature, sensitive, intelligent and volitional. The knowledge, which is at first implicit, grows by experience and inference into explicit, and becomes ever richer. He respects the principle *Ignoti nulla cupido*, and, at least in regard to natural processes, he would not go along with his almost namesake Thomasinus, by adopting from Plotinus the view that simply we can be said to desire the Supreme Good before intellectually we apprehend it (*De Dio*, lib. 8, c. 2). Rather apprehension and desire, according to St. Thomas and Mr. Balfour, both grow gradually in definition. Not *a priori* but *a posteriori* men come to see what is implied in every desire of good and every knowledge of truth : though Mr. Balfour used to question the view that knowledge could be implicit. St. Thomas makes capital out of the consequences that can be deduced from the implications of such ideas as self-existent, produced ; necessary, contingent ; infinite, finite. In this way he travels onward to such propositions as these : " All creatures that exercise the faculty of knowledge know God implicitly in every object that comes under their ken " (*Quæstiones de Veritate*, XI. Q. 22, A. 2, ad. 1). St. Thomas also says, " A knowledge of God in a general and a confused way lies in their very nature, inasmuch as God is man's beatitude. Man

The Gifford Lectures of

naturally desires and therein knows his Beatitude" (*Summa Iae*, Q. II. A. 2, ad. 1). The results formally derivable from these principles and the ways of proving them may be seen summarized in scholastic text-books treating of General Metaphysics and Natural Theology. The methods are so strange to ordinary lay thought that it takes patience to see their force.

One impediment to ethical religious truth, which concerns its practical adoption, St. Thomas did not understand in the fuller range now given to it by research. He would with Mr. Balfour have recognized how the sensitive conditions alter the beliefs of lovers in their courtship about one another's unparalleled excellence. But he did not know the data of modern pathology which gives some credibility to the opinion that a man who apparently understands religion and moral precepts, yet may perhaps be anæsthetic practically to their obligations. With him they do not catch on, bite, come home. If such is his condition, it is prepared for in what we know from pathology about the antecedently incredible "gaps" in the memory series and in other functions of mind.

Mr. Balfour at any rate gives real objective validity to his ethical and religious beliefs. He could not rest satisfied with a subjective derivation of them as phenomena biological, physiological, psychological, but requires beliefs to be valid objectively in our convictions. He would not be content with the self-complacent saying of the empirical school, that whatever else God may be He must be experience. Nor would Mr. Walter Pater please him by saying, "Not the fruit of experience, but experience itself is the end." The solidity of Mr. Balfour's creed is witnessed to by the concluding words of his volume :

God must not be treated as an entity which we may add to, or subtract from, the sum of things scientifically known. He is Himself the condition of all scientific knowledge. If He be excluded from the causal series which produces beliefs, the cognitive sense which justifies them is corrupted in its root.

Mr Balfour

And it is only in a theistic setting that beauty can retain its deepest meaning and love its brightest lustre, so that these truths of æsthetics and ethics are but half-truths, isolated and imperfect, unless we add to them yet a third. We must hold that reason and the works of reason have their source in God: that from Him they draw their inspiration, and that if they repudiate their origin, by the very act they proclaim their own insufficiency.

BEFORE *the* HIERARCHY

The Sequel to Catholic Emancipation. By Mgr Bernard Ward,
President of St Edmund's College. In Two Volumes.
London, Longmans & Co.

THANKS to St. Edmund's College we now possess, in eight admirably printed and illustrated volumes, the story of our Catholic predecessors from the disastrous reign of James II down to the Hierarchy under which we are living. Dr Burton has given us back the Venerable Challoner, as he wrought in silence and did imperishable things. Monsignor Ward, taking up the thread from 1791, brings us on through bright and dark with a world of interesting detail to the so-called Papal Aggression "from out of the Flaminian Gate," which startled Protestant Britons, and made them rub their eyes at the unexpected apparition of a ghost in sunshine bearing every token of a fresh lease of life upon him. To us Catholics all this should be familiar as household words and known by heart, even where the record touches, as it often must, on quarrels between good men now smiling at them in Heaven. What and how much does it signify to Imperial England? That remains to be seen. Traveling among these faded and forgotten manuscripts, after one has read a little in European literature of the same date, is like wandering in by-paths. The inevitable seclusion of old English Catholics; their timidities and weaknesses; their hole-and-corner disputes; their failure to grasp, let alone in any measure to control, the great world-movements around them; these things leave us with a chill sense, as if the men themselves had been finally defeated and shovelled out of the way, while history went on. Their biography might be their epitaph, with no "Resurgam" upon it. For they did not cherish large schemes of to-morrow; their religion had become almost an individual worship, practised in secret. Never did the conquest of the nation by force of ideas, or by appeal to new social influences, enter their thoughts.

Before the Hierarchy

They could always be martyrs ; but they were dead to the world.

This condition of an heroic but passive minority in a fast changing time was made all the more evident when Emancipation challenged them to come out of their Ghetto. The seven Catholic peers took their seats in the House of Lords. A few Catholics were returned to the House of Commons. They styled themselves Whigs ; but the name implied only that they knew nothing about democracy or the people. During the twenty years with which Mgr Ward's concluding volumes are occupied, three distinct series of events were to happen, completely altering the shape, and two of them multiplying the numbers, of English Catholicism—I mean the Tractarian Movement, the migration of Irish exiles into Great Britain, due to successive waves of famine at home, and the Revolution of 1848. Strokes of good or ill fortune, these turning-points in history were chance accidents, so far as the Catholic remnant was concerned. It had no policy touching the Puseyites, or the Irish exodus, or the popular uprising abroad to which Chartism corresponded on this side of the Channel. Modern problems lay beyond its horizon. To charge these deficiencies as faults upon good men, excellent priests and bishops devoted to their duties, would be the height of injustice. But history, while giving them full credit for what they did, is compelled to register that which they failed to do. We shall find names of which we have reason to be proud ; with exceptions such as Lingard and Ullathorne they scarcely belong to the old Catholic pedigree. Accessions of strength came to the exhausted body from Rome, Oxford, London, Ireland. Among the Vicars Apostolic one, Dr Baines, who had ambition, was a dreamer of dreams ; Wiseman stands alone ; and the rest were not qualified to open new paths, but spent themselves on needful tasks, edifying and hidden, as before the Revolution, which had now insisted on making all things new.

We begin with Dr Baines, a prelate of the Renaissance, but saintly no less than magnificent, born out of due time.

Before the Hierarchy

He took the stage before Wiseman, acting a sort of prelude to him which did not succeed, nor could have done so. Friends and enemies describe him in much the same terms, as irresistible in address and self-willed, the grave and lofty figure of Aristotle's *Ethics*, who knows that he was meant for heroic deeds. He made such an impression at Rome that Leo XII had him in view for the Sacred College. But he chose rather to attempt in the Western District, where Catholics could scarcely be detected, the founding of a seminary at Prior Park on a grand scale, with outlooks towards even a university. Yet, unlike Wiseman, he did not anticipate the "conversion of England," but laughed the idea to scorn when Father Ignatius Spencer came asking for prayers with that object. Dr Baines in his masterful way naturally roused opposition. Among the strangest episodes of his life was the attempt to capture Downside from one company of Benedictines (the validity of all English Benedictine vows he questioned) and to transfer it to another from Ampleforth. He brought the Rosminian Order to England, but quarrelled with them, as he did on all sides, using his episcopal powers to enforce a vehement rhetoric, and drawing upon his own head remonstrances which might have ended in censures from the Roman authorities. Those who are acquainted with the life and writings of Bishop Warburton, his Anglican predecessor in the mansion at Prior Park, may find amusement in tracing a resemblance between these two fighting prelates. They were both intemperate of speech, big and burly, good-natured but yet intractable. Warburton, however, is a celebrity who by virtue of his paradoxical but suggestive theme in the *Divine Legation of Moses*, and much more by his racy correspondence with Bishop Hurd, will always keep a place in English literature. Dr Baines is a local memory. The vicissitudes of beautiful and stately Prior Park were tragic indeed ; more tragic still was the wasted life of a man in whose composition some elements of greatness cannot be overlooked.

What would have been the fate of English Catholi-

Before the Hierarchy

cism left to itself under good men of routine such as Dr Walsh in the Midlands, Dr Griffiths in London, and others whose names one does not immediately recall? But left to itself it was not. One of the most acute and accomplished of the little flock, John Lingard, preferred his study to the first seat in the synagogue. As with a Roman stylus, not indulging the picturesque, he wrote a History of England which more recent research has not antiquated, from documents sought all over the kingdom, in his modest Lancashire presbytery. At the end of a long life he burnt his correspondence, a sacrifice which we would have redeemed by many hecatombs of formal pages. He knew more of his Catholic contemporaries than will ever be told. Yet Lingard is not altogether the type of the years now under consideration. His bent was for exact methods and results, gained from Gibbon's example, in the cool element of prose. Certain others, especially converts of whom Kenelm Digby and Ambrose Lisle Phillips were the earliest instances, came to reflect in a somewhat tempered ray the glow of Romance, as it shone with splendour in Chateaubriand's *Génie du Christianisme*; while the claims of the Holy See which Joseph de Maistre championed would find advocates in Oxford by and by who were yet sceptics or Evangelicals. Chateaubriand, de Maistre, the youthful Victor Hugo and, across the Rhine, learning embodied in Fr. Schlegel, Molitor, Möhler, to be succeeded by Dollinger and the whole School of Munich, were so many heralds of a new dawn in the Catholic sky. Everywhere the triumph of Romanticism in literature and art was turning men's minds to the ancient faith. Its gleams began to pierce their way into the dull pseudo-classic assembly-rooms where this poor little storm-tossed remnant of ours met to hear Mass, which they still in their terrified dialect had not ceased to call attending at "prayers." Their dark age was passing.

The Muse of History, who is nothing if not ironical, takes pleasure in observing that Romanticism sprang up elsewhere than at Rome. Rome in 1830 would have

Before the Hierarchy

entered as little into the spirit of northern poesy as it would have welcomed the Gothic architecture which, by revival or restoration, was to cover France, Belgium, Germany, and the British Isles with its trophies. Overbeck and Cornelius set up schools of design in the Eternal City ; but no Italian was likely to forsake his own great masters and imitate this least successful of religious efforts in painting. Rome would be always the capital of classic tradition, exalted or debased ; and who could wish for a Bruges or Nuremberg on the banks of the Tiber ? Yet between the Romantic worship of mediæval Catholicism and devotion to the Holy See how could there fail to be innumerable affinities ? Happily, in the Venerable English College of St. Thomas a man was found whose large intellect, amounting to genius, enabled him to combine these views and to act upon them in Rome as in England. We may justly affirm of Nicholas Wiseman that he did for this country in the nineteenth century what St. Theodore of Tarsus did for it in the seventh. He is the Golden Mile at which all the ways of our living Catholicism meet, and from which they start. To his English training at Ushaw he was indebted for a fine simple piety. From many scholars and statesmen abroad he learned to cast his religion into those ample proportions that became the Church of Christendom. He saw it in bold relief, with a past in which every form of human achievement was grandly represented ; and he offered it to the modern world as an ever-flowing source of beauty, light, and joy. Myself brought up in this atmosphere, I feel how much more congenial it is to the religious mood, even while the impulse given goes far to satisfy the legitimate claims of art and science, than the forensic triumphs where argument ruled alone. Wiseman, too, could argue in the old style ; his reasoning, or rather his quotation from the Fathers, disarmed Newman and brought him down. But *Fabiola* with its picture of the Catacombs may be set beside *Les Martyrs* of Chateaubriand, as better than logical proof, as bringing out the very life of our faith shown by things real and by the men

Before the Hierarchy

and women whose memorials they are. This, too, was the aim of Romanticism, an experience renewed, putting an end to verbal controversy.

Wiseman became a Vicar Apostolic because in no other position could he fulfil his burning desire to draw English Catholics within the movement of revival. He was not, speaking by the card, a successful "Ordinary," any more than a good administrator. As Rector of the English College he left its management to look after itself. At Oscott, which had been unfeelingly taken from Dr Weedall (my revered predecessor at Leamington) to make a free stage for Wiseman's activities, he took no part in the regular work, while the numbers languished and the finances did not prosper. Unacquainted with mission duties, absorbed in his own projects, not easily brooking opposition, which cut him to the quick, he was that very difficult sort of superior who is at once imperious and sensitive. He had the ways of a Spanish grandee, making people smile when they saw him arrive at Douay with a train of dependents, or driving about London in a Lord Mayor's carriage modelled on the Cardinal's great lumbering equipages in Rome. A slightly keener sense of the incongruous on such points would have saved him and the Church in England some trouble, perhaps even might have averted the No-Popery agitation of 1850. Wiseman had the candour of a child, the rash impetuosity of a boy, and a vein of sentimentalism prompting him to mistake the character of those to whom he was deeply attached. One word more is necessary. Generous in his dealings and most anxious that the poor should have the Gospel preached to them, he belonged to the party of Metternich, felt a natural sympathy with persons of rank, and was an admirer as well as a correspondent of Prince Louis Napoleon, afterwards Emperor of the French.

Three names mark the fifteen critical years, 1835-1850, which saw the Tractarian Movement come to its height and break up, the Liberal policy of Pius IX founder, and the Hierarchy assume the general form it retained until the other day. These are, of course, Wiseman,

Before the Hierarchy

Pugin, and Newman. It was a gracious stroke of irony that selected Oxford—Tory and bigoted Oxford—to “quicken the soul in dying men” (a phrase that Newman often quoted from the *Agamemnon* of Æschylus) when some of our oldest Catholic families were conforming to the Church of England, and there seemed little hope that anything equal to the burden of the age would be undertaken by those they left behind. In any case, no doubt, Wiseman must have exchanged the College in Rome for a Vicariate ; though London was barred to him by Dr Griffiths after or because of the too brilliant lectures in Moorfields, and Dr Baines resented his well-meant advice. That the first occasion of the Lectures was providential their author felt. They arose from the visit paid to him at the Venerable by Newman and Hurrell Froude, in April, 1833, when they were voyaging by the coasts of the “Midland Sea moaning with memories,” drawing from ancient Christian sites inspiration for the work which they knew was awaiting them in England. They had come out to discover the Church of the Fathers : they lighted upon Rome. It was a parable which held in it a forecast. The interview changed men who would naturally have been opponents into future allies, little as they foresaw it at the time. But from the day they met, as Wiseman wrote in 1847, never did he waver in his conviction that a new era had begun for Catholicism at home. By degrees he laid aside his Oriental studies. He dedicated his life to this one aim. But he did not yet anticipate the actual course of events, as who indeed could while English Catholics had still no purchase on their fellow-countrymen, and Oxford, precisely because it was appealing to Laud and antiquity, cast a glamour upon the *Via Media* which, as they maintained, ran or marched between Geneva and Papal Rome ?

Yet in Papal Rome, not in Canterbury, the wonder-working spell of religion, confronted with German philosophies, English ungodly economics, French licence of thought and action, was destined to be found, if any-

Before the Hierarchy

where in modern latitudes. On his first half-reluctant pilgrimage to the Apostle's shrine, Newman had cried out, "And now what can I say of Rome but that it is the first of cities, and that all I ever saw are but as dust (even dear Oxford) compared with its majesty and glory?" In feeling verses of his own he echoed Byron's aspiration :

O Rome, my country, city of the soul,
The exiles of the heart all turn to thee.

Where was the keystone in the arch of humanity if not where history had placed it? In old time the "Roman Peace" which brooded over civilisation was a world-encompassing reality. Must we not say the same now of Rome's faith, protecting religion? Poets or historians, classic scholars or romantic devotees of the Middle Ages, all who went that way recognized its lonely grandeur, as the sacred Mother City whence our Western peoples had been taught the Gospel and the arts of life. This was the true realized ideal held up to generations which could only wander adrift when they strayed from it, a thing so concrete that we might lay our hand on it, as if it were flesh and blood, yet whose power none would ever exhaust, for it was more than a barren fact, being the creation of the spirit.

That Rome is the head and front of historical Christianity has been during the last fifty years more and more demonstrated. Systems come and go; the living society upon which speculation frames its theories abides. After the Revolution had transformed Europe, men largely differing in their point of view looked up at the Roman Church with astonishment and awe, as the one institution which survived from a shattered universe. Luther and Calvin were antiques in comparison with the Pope. Their day was over; the Roman Pontiff bore himself undauntedly still as of old against principalities and powers. The social instinct which has done all it could to vanquish anarchic Liberalism laid hold some-

Before the Hierarchy

what blindly on our forms of brotherhood and tried to imitate them. In France the school of Saint-Simon, L'Enfantin, Comte, were endeavouring, as Huxley said long afterwards, to be Catholics while they declined to be Christians—a paradoxical situation which could not last. And, on this side, Macaulay's yet unsurpassed delineation in 1840 of Papal Rome was nothing else than the homage of genius laid on the altar of the *Semper Eadem* in religion. This unchanging but most fertile power, enduring age after age, drawing to its bosom all nations, subduing alike the philosopher and the fanatic, depending on none of its great men, while seemingly capable of outliving what should have been mortal wounds, has in Macaulay's pages and in fact the character we call objective. It supplies to the story of religion not less than to its practice a foundation such as experience yields to science. Secure in the past, Rome looks onward to the future without fear. There is not a syllable to erase in the conclusion of the essayist, who for one moment was caught up to the oracular mount: "Nor do we see any sign that the term of her long dominion is approaching. She saw the commencement of all the governments and of all the ecclesiastical establishments that now exist in the world; and we feel no assurance that she is not destined to see the end of them all." Macaulay, I do not doubt, was adapting to an everyday style the prophetic lines of Virgil, where the Father of gods and men pledges himself to the Roman rulers of mankind for ever:—

His ego nec metas rerum nec tempora pono,
Imperium sine fine dedi.

On that vision of Rome, vouchsafed to so many, I would found my argument and draw the perspective in which the Catholic Revival, now more than eighty years in progress, ought to be set. Our still disheartened folk, their imagination dulled by suffering of which we do not know the taste, beheld the glories of the Vatican as in a land very far off. They had sealed the faith with a

Before the Hierarchy

crimson seal ; yet its beauty was hidden from their eyes. To Oxford the Latin literature was exceedingly familiar, down to the period when it became Christian ; but Newman learnt much in course of time from St. Augustine, and his devotion to St Ambrose dated from boyhood. Hurrell Froude was drawn to the Mediæval Church with its Hildebrand, its Thomas of Canterbury, and its combats against Erastian Emperors. But even in the case of mild students like Pusey and Keble, as in that of Newman until he arrived almost on the threshold of submission, the prejudice clung which affirmed the Pope to be Antichrist. We smile, and wonder how such a nightmare could have haunted the Oxford Chapels, where the stones cried out of the walls that it was blasphemy. There is less trouble in perceiving what had come about, as by natural decay, among English Catholics debarred (to mention a cause often overlooked) from travelling abroad during well nigh twenty-five years by the war with France. All that generation, of which De Quincey and Miss Austen are excelling types, suffered from an insularity so prolonged and gave tokens of it in their writings. Hence the question of life or death for our people resolved itself into holding up before them the vision of Rome, fixing the light steadily upon it, and compelling men to take it in. On the one hand, if I may adapt a remarkable phrase from Bishop Ullathorne not used about them, it cannot be denied that these honest men were capable of holding some portion of the facts they believed "with faint apprehension" ; while, on the other, a teacher stood ready for them who, in the words of Bernard Smith, was always "a great cosmopolitan." This epithet reveals Wiseman in his most telling aspect. To him the Catholic idea of the Church diffused "per orbem terrarum" was ever present ; he could not conceive of it as in the first place local or national. We see him throwing down the prison-gates of what I ventured to name the Catholic Ghetto. Not less vigorously does he uplift his voice in refutation of the Anglican by the African parallel which Donatism, a particularist heresy,

Before the Hierarchy

afforded. His word "Securus judicat," taken from St. Augustine, has become a proverb which outweighs volumes of controversy, while reducing the problem otherwise lost in detail to simplest terms. It was like asking, "Can there be a circle without a centre?" If not, Catholic implies Roman. At last, then, battle might be joined on a plain issue.

English Catholic writers knew this well; but much of their energy had been wasted in the antiquarian labyrinth where Jewel and his Laudian successors, nothing loth, contrived to entangle them on a quest after the mind of the Fathers. A living historian, Mgr Duchesne, has remarked to the point, that until critics were called in who could sift the genuine remains of antiquity from the spurious, this problem which brought the whole subject of development forward was difficult handling. Moreover, as is clear, the Gospel, though it may be defended by erudition, is something else than scholarship: it is an immense public and even political fact. The Gallicanism with which English Catholics were often charged was a tendency, resisted by Milner, to lay more stress on the parts than on the whole of the Church, to look on Rome as a court of supreme and therefore only occasional instance, rather than the ubiquitous governing power which its prerogatives entitle it to be. Vicars Apostolic seldom travelled *ad limina*; they transacted business not immediately with Propaganda but through an agent (who for many years was Wiseman himself) and they had forgotten or never known the "stylus Curiae" by which Roman congregations expected local authorities to address them. A lamentable consequence was the ill-will, not to say wrath, which good, innocent prelates like Dr Griffiths, Dr Walsh, and at times the assembled Vicars provoked in the Vatican by neglecting courtesies the import of which they did not recognise, by their silence and aloofness when they should have gone straight to the Holy Father. Wiseman, moving on a different line, with advantage to his fame and influence, roused a jealousy at home which never quite died away, as the

Before the Hierarchy

attitude of Canon Tierney and his friends proved. The Vicars themselves suspected him, and did not want such a master in Israel to give them lessons. He, on the other hand, reported to Gregory XVI how much might be done by way of reform and restoration if enlightened zeal could get an open path. In his private correspondence he took a still more condemnatory tone, which the volumes under notice would not justify. And here I am disposed to reiterate a distinction, already hinted, between the principles of action dictated to the English clergy by their experience in the past and Wiseman's more sanguine policy for a future that would not resemble it.

Milner is the connecting link of old and new, as the Midland District is the field and St Mary's, Oscott, the open theatre, where these two methods of dealing with England show at their best. Oscott and Oxford, names of unequal renown, fill the second ten years from 1840 to 1850, at the close of which Vicars Apostolic make room for the Hierarchy. To Milner succeeded Dr Walsh, who in the Oscott annals receives the title of Archbishop Designate of Westminster, his lawful due. Dr Walsh laid no claim to greatness; but he built "this noble College in the very heart of England," as Wiseman called it, on a commanding site and in a cloistered style taken from Oxford. He founded St Chad's Cathedral at Birmingham; he welcomed Pugin's efforts to create an architecture worthy of religion; and when others were determined that the aspiring Roman rector "should never be a bishop in England," he made him his Coadjutor, giving him a free hand. Pugin, with impetuous honesty, wrote in 1839 to Lisle Phillips that "Dr Walsh found the churches in his District worse than barns; he will leave them sumptuous erections. The greater part of the vestments were filthy rags, and he has replaced them with silk and gold." It was the same unassuming prelate who appointed Pugin to lecture at Oscott on ecclesiastical architecture and antiquities a year before Wiseman's arrival. This extraordinary genius, for whom the Gothic movement already begun seemed to have been

Before the Hierarchy

waiting that it might conquer these Islands by his insight and passion, was of French descent, born in 1812 at Freiburg in Baden, a convert without any guidance but his own reading in 1834, and the intimate friend of Ambrose Phillips, for whom he designed St Bernard's Abbey, the first monastery set up in England since their total suppression. Newman has put on record the deep sense which he always had of Pugin's merits, though himself addicted to the later Roman school in church-building. "His zeal, his innate diligence, his resources, his invention, his imagination, his sagacity in research, are all of the highest order," he says in a letter to Phillips dated June 15, 1848; but he went on to observe, what by that time had become unhappily true, "The canons of Gothic architecture are to him points of faith, and everyone is a heretic who would venture to question them."

Looking back, we perceive now that Pugin was the hero of an episode, magnificent indeed, yet passing like the special phase of Romance to which it gave lustre. To his originality in the very act of copying his least favourable critics bear witness. Had means been adequately furnished, had the noble plans he drew not suffered through the sheer ignorance of those who were incapable of judging them, the many monuments which he devised or executed in so brief a time at lightning speed might have almost rivalled the shrines to which they owed their beauty. Even as they stand a certain mysterious charm whispers of the artist to whom religion was the one supreme inspiration, whatever he attempted. To Pugin architecture meant Catholic symbolism; he could not view it in any other light. The Church was not a meeting house where people sat comfortably listening to florid music and showy preachers, but the tabernacle of God with men, a "great Sacrament," the heart of which was our Lord's Eucharistic presence. He poured sarcasm, withering in its fierce humour, on the fashions and concerts, the "shilling opera," the tawdriness and dull formality characteristic of an age when excitement of feeling alternated with routine, while faith and

Before the Hierarchy

worship suffered equally from both. Pugin was a true mystic as the Catholic creed allows, and as Catholic saints practice mysticism. This taking of symbols for sacraments (using the word largely) had so utterly died out of modern minds that even devout spirits like Ruskin confounded it with a weak sentiment to which sensuous things appealed. Ruskin, whose "rabid Protestantism" would be afterwards flung off as savagely as it had been put on, was quite unaware of the Catholic secret, and construed our Ritual, which finds expression in every material it employs, as "pomp and picturesqueness." In *The Stones of Venice* (Volume I, 1851), he strikes at "Romanist art" and Pugin's genius with an insolence bordering on vulgarity. The passage is lively enough. "But of all these fatuities," he exclaims, "the basest is the being lured into the Romanist Church by the glitter of it, like larks into a trap by broken glass; to be blown into a change of religion by the whine of an organ-pipe; stitched into a new creed by gold threads on priests' petticoats; jangled into a change of conscience by the chimes of a belfry. I know nothing in the shape of error so dark as this." More follows, which I shall not quote. All one need say in extenuation is to be found in Letter 76 of *Fors Clavigera*, where Ruskin does public penance by confessing that "the religious teaching in those books"—*The Stones* and *Modern Painters*—"and all the more for the sincerity of it, is misleading—sometimes even poisonous, always in a manner ridiculous." Pugin has been well avenged.

How little of a dilettante-playing with fair sights this movement was, the retreats, missions, and life-long vocations to self-sacrifice will prove, which were promoted by such spiritual guides as the Rosminian Dr Gentili, the Passionist Father Dominic, and the Capuchin Father Mathew, "apostle of Temperance." Wiseman, who delighted in the solemn offices of the Liturgy and carried them out with splendour, himself gave the "Exercises" of St Ignatius at Oscott. The Cistercians in Charnwood Forest, vowed to contemplation, won converts all round

Before the Hierarchy

by their labour and silence. When Lord Shrewsbury lavished a fortune on building churches he did so in the hope of turning from his house the fate of past sacrilege. Catholic art was Catholic prayer made visible, a scene from the Apocalypse of St John. Had not Pugin or another risen up at the providential moment, half the victory over Protestantism might have been lost. Every church designed by him was "the Lord's anointed temple," in which "the life of the building" dwelt ever beneath Sacramental veils. This, before all else, was wanting to the English Establishment, and no study of the ancient Fathers could bring it back.

I doubt if the Tractarians knew their own problem when they set about restoring religion as though it were a dead language sepulchred in books. Englishmen had long been used to write of Catholic doctrine, and still more of its practice, in the past tense. Oxford in 1833 began to calculate the true dimensions of Christianity across the centuries, with endless pains, instead of recognising that antiquity survived at Rome and energized through the nations subject to it. That may have been a reason why English Catholics, not much given to research, took small account of scholars busied upon folios in the Bodleian, whose names they seldom heard. Wiseman, versatile and observant, an "eruditus" rather than a pure theologian, wondered how so remarkable a movement away from the Reformers should fail to stir the attention of his fellow-believers. He had set up the DUBLIN REVIEW, in conjunction with O'Connell; and henceforth he made it a speaking trumpet by which to instruct both parties of their relation to one another. When he established himself at Oscott, the blow had been struck by which he shattered Newman's "Via Media"; but naturally he was not told of its effect. Pugin served as a light-heeled Mercury to flit between Oscott and Magdalen College, where his friend Bloxam (called by and by the Father of Ritualism) was a Fellow, steeped in Catholic ideas but timid in acting upon them. Another who played a conspicuous part as intermediary was Ambrose

Before the Hierarchy

Phillips. Negotiations, though Newman disclaimed the word, took place by correspondence, most of which we are still able to read, and by personal interviews at Oxford, Garendon and Oscott. There were sudden conversions, followed once and again by relapses. Two points of view emerged on the Catholic side, the first, which was traditional and has prevailed, regarding the Establishment as a sect, without priests or bishops, not descended from our Hierarchy which ruled before the Reformation, but a creation of law and of the Crown, dating from the Tudors. Hence all its members were bound individually to forsake it as soon as their conscience recognised the claims of Papal Rome. The second point of view was held to his dying day by Lisle Phillips; he contended that "the existing Church of England is the same organic body as that which Pope Gregory founded in the sixth century." In 1839 he wrote to Father Proctor, O.P., "I have always wished that the Anglican orders might be admitted"; and he was meditating on "the future union of Christendom," a title which he gave in 1864 to his A.P.U.C. pamphlet, where he allowed himself to speak of "the separated portions of the Church." In the period before us, when the "Branch theory" held sway at Oxford, and Corporate Reunion could be only a sort of Greek Kalends, it was not difficult to foresee that conversions would be checked by language so confusing, however amiably intended. It bordered, in fact, on heresy.

Wiseman's conduct of the principles involved did him honour as a faithful steward over the Catholic household, yearning for the submission of England to the Apostolic See, but under no delusion about the true nature of Anglicanism. He addressed Lord Shrewsbury in a public "Letter on Catholic Unity" in 1841, prompted by the agitation seething round Tract 90. Staying his argument on previous attempts at reconciliation, but especially on the proposal once thrown out by Bossuet to explain the Confession of Augsburg in accordance with the Tridentine decrees, he met Newman half way. But he yielded

Before the Hierarchy

not an iota to the demand that Rome "should reform her abuses." In any sense implicating the Church there could be no abuses to reform, though misapprehensions admitted of clearing up, when things were viewed from within the sanctuary. Subject to this change of focus, Wiseman boldly advocated the reunion of the English Establishment "with the Holy See and the Churches of its obedience." The phrase takes us back to the Western Schism and might have been challenged; it was meant simply to open a conference with Newman's following. Of "mutual concessions," as between parties dealing on equal terms, Wiseman would not hear. His memorable despatch to the Vatican in 1857, still occupied with Lisle Phillips and the matter of Corporate Reunion, says truly that he "had impugned all right on the part of Anglicans to the name of Church." He had never allowed its "orders, mission, sacraments, or instruction in doctrine." He preached individual submission the moment that conscience decided in favour of Rome's prerogatives. Of course he would be the first to welcome negotiations which were calculated to bring the English people in; he wrote as though this were chiefly dependent on the clergy, above all, on the Oxford Tractarians—a singularly false judgment which was apt in all these tentative discussions to make them unreal and of none effect. There is something almost ludicrous in the notion of Parliament, county families, business men, the Press and the public submitting to pious clerics and being led by them to the Flaminian Gate. England, in mid-nineteenth century, rejected Newman, utterly despised Catholic ideals, moved in a world where Bentham dictated the utilitarian philosophy which aimed only at heaping up riches and made poverty a crime. Tory Oxford was fighting its last battle, not advancing to conquer the Liberals who, ten or twelve years later, would revolutionize its studies and laicize its institutions. Phaethon was preparing to guide the sun's chariot out of its course.

During these days of drama the Tractarians themselves broke asunder, Keble and Pusey cleaving to their native

Before the Hierarchy

Church, Ward calling it humbly to sue at the feet of Rome for pardon and restoration, while the leader in retreat at Littlemore gave no certain sound to either party. In 1843 Wiseman's correspondence with Oxford ceased altogether, and he nearly lost heart. Conversions elsewhere went on, much as they do now, intermittently. In June, 1844, *The Ideal of a Christian Church* was published by Ward, a piece of triumphant logic that found the centre of the circle, unchurched the Erastian Establishment, obliterated the "Via Media," and reverted absolutely to the position always maintained by English Catholics. Ward's appeal was to present experience. "Look on this picture and on that." He knew little of history; the standard he took was saintliness, the motive on which he rested was the supernatural. Given these premises, what could the conclusion be save Rome? In this procedure we need not deny how great was the influence exerted by de Maistre and even by Comte. This "positive" method, however, had the advantage of suiting a nation profoundly distrustful of metaphysics, eager for facts, and so far democratic that it wanted simple but comprehensive statements as a guide to social reconstruction. The *Development* was written for thinkers; the *Ideal* threw itself upon life. English Catholics had no philosopher among them in those days; certainly Wiseman's gifts would not qualify him to act the part. He knew what saints had done and were yet capable of doing. He read the *Ideal* with exulting hope. Information came that Newman might now submit from one hour to another. And the Tractarian Movement received its mortal stroke on February 13, 1845, when Ward suffered "degradation" in the Sheldonian theatre.

Father Dominic received Newman on October 9, without concessions or treaty of any sort. English churchmen kept on their way amid Liberalism, Ritualism, Agnosticism, Modernism. The paths which had seemed for a little while to be approaching crossed at right angles. For while Rome insisted more and more upon authority,

Before the Hierarchy

guarding its historical treasure, Oxford and England gave up Bible, Church, religion itself to criticism. The problem stated in dazzling terms by Macaulay of the Christian future had been resolved affirmatively in favour of the "Mother and Mistress of all Churches," but negatively against the Gospel itself by those who would not recognize St Peter in his Cathedra Veritatis.

When such far-reaching consequences were at stake the Vicars Apostolic pursued their laborious and indispensable task of providing clergy, churches and schools for the growing flock. The Irish famine brought multitudes of destitute into a strange land. Frederick Lucas, a convert from Quakerism, founded the *Tablet*, quarrelled right and left, was a thorn in the side of Dr Griffiths and a trouble to Wiseman; but, as Montalembert wrote, Catholics were everywhere wanting in spirit and Lucas had spirit abundantly. To him we owe the right defence of elementary education, which persons high in place would have abandoned to the tender mercies of Whitehall. Old Catholics, Irish emigrants, Oxford converts—such were to be the main strands in a web now visibly woven by the hand of Providence. Some rough seams appeared in the making of that "new people" which the mind of Challoner foreboded. A new people cried out for a restored Hierarchy. We may believe on grounds of rather sad history that few policies have been more mistaken than the determination to let the original English line of bishops die out. Judgment as by default was given against our afflicted remnant. Vicars Apostolic of Far Eastern Sees could not claim to be successors of St Anselm or St Thomas. The hour was come when the same authority which had sent Augustine and Theodore should create under the Fisherman's ring a province with Archbishop and Suffragans, where some few sheep had dwelt in the wilderness.

But, as in earlier stages, checks and disasters waited upon this undertaking. The Vicars desired it; Roman opinion was far from averse to it. Meetings were held, schemes drawn out; the number of Vicars Apostolic was doubled

Before the Hierarchy

in 1840. Still years passed, and Gregory XVI along with them, before a second step was taken. The restoration of ordinary Church government in this country is due to Pius IX, who decided that it must be done. Characteristic it is of the slow policy which these excellent men pursued that they were sending as their representative to Propaganda not one of their own body, but a simple priest, Dr Husenbeth, when W. B. Ullathorne, O.S.B., "pastor et nauta," who had been a sailor and was lately made Bishop of the Western District, took the commission instead. His ability, tact, and presence carried the matter through. Yet another pause, the direct consequence of the Roman Revolution, came between the Hierarchy and its fulfilment. Finally, at Michaelmas, 1850, the old order yielded place to the new. And at this point, after a minute account of the whole transaction, Mgr Ward's narrative comes to an end.

There remains, however, an episode curiously appropriate to the subject and the writer. Bishop Ullathorne, who held so distinguished a part in the creation of the Hierarchy, survived to be the last of the Vicars Apostolic. After an episcopate of forty-four years he died at Oscott on St. Benedict's Day, 1889, and Mgr Ward knelt among the company that joined the dying man in prayer. This final touch rounds the whole story into a ring of light. For none ever combined more powerfully in a stern but impressive character the qualities of both Orders than did Bishop Ullathorne. Monk and prelate, missionary, contemplative, writer, administrator, preacher, he had much of Milner's strength and Challoner's love of solitude. As an English Benedictine he bound up in one the heroism of old time with a chivalry which made him the friend and protector of Newman through many tribulations. He is a great name, and he bequeathed to Oscott as to the Midlands a great tradition, not perhaps unfairly summed up in the words, "*Per ardua stabilis.*" The faith is ever the same ; but to send forth judgment unto victory every generation must bring to it a fresh enthusiasm.

Before the Hierarchy

These things, with skill in story-telling, with honesty which no cowardice comes near, with a feeling for all the virtue, obscure or celebrated, that our chronicles hold in them, Mgr Ward has wrought into a monument on which his own name will commend itself to English Catholics, when they desire to understand how the past gave birth to larger achievements than it ever dared to hope. How great was the thing done may be gathered from the testimony of a recent and unsuspected witness, who, after describing Protestantism as "a lean method of observance and worship which finds the soul in nudity and cares for it without clothing it"—a condition which "reached its apex" in the "early Victorian period"—goes on to affirm that "the beginning of our salvation from the all-wretchedness of this state and system came about unquestionably from the restoration of the Roman Hierarchy in Great Britain and Ireland."* As we know, the true Irish succession never died out. It was England that needed the healing touch of St. Peter. But the vision of Rome is our inheritance. In the seven volumes now complete we learn what a price our ancestors paid that it might be saved for England and us.

WILLIAM BARRY.

* *The Way of Divine Union.* By A. E. Waite, p. 302.

The EASTERN CHURCHES AND THE WAR

Photius. Hergenröther. Ratisbon : 1869.

Orthodox Eastern Church. Fortescue. London : 1906.

Union zu Brest, translated into German by Jedzink. Likowski.
Freiburg: 1904.

Verfassung und gegenwärtiger Bestand sämtlicher Kirchen des
Orients. Silbernagl. 1904.

La difesa di Christianesimo. Nicola Franco. Rome : 1910.

L'Orient et Rome. Michel. Paris : 1905.

La Chiesa Russa. Aurelia Palmieri. Florence : 1908.

La Russie et L'Eglise Universelle. Vladimir Soloviev. Paris :
1889.

THE war is still with us, and it is difficult to prognosticate when it will end. But it is in the nature of man to look forward, and many are speculating on the problems that will clamour for solution when the days of peace and reconstruction at length return. One of these problems is of a religious nature, and appeals with a special interest to Catholics, and those with them who long for the time when Christendom will be united once more as it was in the primitive centuries of the Christian period. In the West will the divisions caused by the Reformation ever be healed ? And is the sad separation between the East and the West, which so far has endured for nearly nine centuries, and been the cause of so much mischief, to endure to the end ? Or will the effect of this war, which is causing people to revise their judgments on so many points, be to cause them to abandon the prejudices which are what chiefly stand in the way of a return to unity on the part of the religious-minded population of the great Russian Empire ? This is a question which many are asking just now ; and our object in this article is not, indeed, to deal with it adequately, but to suggest a few points for consideration to those who take a deep interest in the good cause and wish, according to their opportunities, to work for it.

The Eastern Churches

Let us begin by setting before us a brief, comprehensive statement of the facts of this far-reaching division, facts which are only imperfectly understood by the majority of our people. According to Father Krose's statistics (for which see the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, s.v. "Statistics"), which do not differ materially from those of other authorities, and are based on sound principles of calculation, there are at present about 292 millions of Catholics in the world, as against 127 millions of Orthodox. By the term Orthodox we mean those who seceded from the communion of the Holy See under Photius and Michael Cerularius in the ninth and eleventh centuries. The term, indeed, contains an assumption which we are not prepared to admit, but it is the accepted name for this great communion, and it is as such that we use it. These members of the Orthodox Church are not the only separatists from Catholic communion in the East. There are besides those who went into schism in the fifth century, by reason of their adhesion to the Nestorian or Monophysite heresies. Those, however, amount altogether to not more than a few millions, and might be expected to come back if the Orthodox should ever set them the example. Accordingly it is to the Orthodox that we shall confine our attention now.

Many persons imagine that by the Orthodox Church is meant one single but enormous communion which looks up to the Patriarch of Constantinople as its supreme spiritual ruler. So it was at the time of the separation in 1054, and so it continued to be until 1589, when the Russian Church broke away from spiritual subjection to Constantinople and asserted its governmental independence. Then a Patriarch of Moscow was established to rule it, and this arrangement lasted till early in the eighteenth century, when Peter the Great, desiring to get the Church to which his subjects belonged more completely under his own thumb, and taking his inspiration from the consistorial system of government in use among the German Evangelicals, substituted for the Patriarchate of Moscow an institution called the Holy

and the War

Synod, sitting permanently at Petrograd and consisting of a few prelates, and clergy of the second order, chosen by the Tsar and dominated by a layman styled the Chief Procurator. To this Holy Synod, which was definitely appointed in 1721, the government of the Russian Church has since been committed, the Bishops throughout the empire becoming little more than its delegates, with hardly any initiative left to them in the administration of their dioceses. A further and multiform cleavage of the Orthodox body was consummated in the nineteenth century, when, following the precedent set by Russia—the precedent that where there is independent civil government there ought also to be independent ecclesiastical government—the various nationalities which succeeded one after the other in freeing themselves from Turkish rule set up independent Churches of their own, under the government of Holy Synods, with their Chief Procurators and all else just as in Russia.

These autocephalous Churches, as they are called, form four main groups, each of which subdivides into others. Hence we have, first, the *Greek* main group, which subdivides into the Greeks of the modern kingdom, numbering about two millions and three-quarters; the Greeks of the Phanariot (so called from the district of Constantinople where the Patriarch lives), including the Greeks of the Turkish Empire in Europe and Asia Minor, together with those of the Turkish islands of the Archipelago, the Orthodox of the now Austrian provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina, numbering altogether about three millions and a half, and, lastly, the Orthodox of Cyprus, who number about two hundred thousand.

The *second* main group comprises the Orthodox of the other three patriarchates, that of Alexandria, numbering about eighty thousand; that of Antioch, with about a quarter of a million; and that of Jerusalem, with about fifty thousand. There is besides attaching to this main group the tiny archbishopric of Sinai, with its fifty members or thereabouts, which claims to be autocephalous, though its right is disputed by the Patriarchs of Jerusa-

The Eastern Churches

lem. Surprise may be felt at the small number of the Orthodox in this vast region, which includes the domains of the three great patriarchates of the ancient Church of the East. This is due to the devastating effects of the Nestorian and Monophysite schisms, intensified as they afterwards were by the spreading flood of the Mohammedan invasion, which in its earlier phases specially affected those territories ; and this also explains why for long periods these three patriarchs were wont to reside at Constantinople, with the result of becoming nonentities, or perhaps one should rather say dignitaries of the ecclesiastical court of the Patriarchs of Constantinople.

The third or *Slav* main group comprises the Church of the Russian Empire, which has vastly more members than all the other Orthodox Churches put together—namely, about seventy-five millions, or, if we include in it the Raskolnics, or Russian Dissenters, whom, however, the Russians themselves consider to be schismatics, about ninety-five millions; the Orthodox of the Bulgarian Exarchate (that is, both those in Bulgaria Proper and those of Bulgarian race distributed through Turkey in Europe), a group which altogether numbers about four millions; the Serbian Church, which is subdivisible into four—namely, the Church of Serbia Proper, with its two millions and a half; the little Church of Montenegro, with its quarter of a million; the Church of the Serbians in Hungary (that is, of those who took refuge there from the Turks when the latter got possession of the Balkan provinces), whose head see is at Carlowitz and who number somewhat over a million; and the small bodies of Serbians, Greco-Serbian, and Roumanians who together compose the Orthodox community in the Austrian Empire, numbering in all about six hundred thousand, and forming an autocephalous Church directed by the Metropolitans of Cernowitz in the Bukovina.

Lastly we have the *Roumanian* main group, which comprises the Orthodox of the kingdom of Roumania, numbering about five millions, whose spiritual head lives at Bucharest, and the Roumanians of Transylvania, who

and the War

are under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan of Hermannstadt and number about one million and three-quarters. Thus we have in all fifteen of these autocephalous Orthodox Churches ; or, if we regard the Church of Bosnia and Herzegovina as autocephalous, as we almost might do, sixteen.

It is necessary to bear in mind what is the relation which subsists between these autocephalous Churches, as estimated from the point of view of unity of faith and communion. So far unity of rite subsists between them all, and substantially unity of doctrine ; for they all use (either in its original Greek text or in that of some translation into their respective ancient vernaculars) the same venerable liturgy which in its longer form is attributed to St Basil and in its shorter to St John Chrysostom, and their doctrinal system is determined by the decrees of the first seven Ecumenical Councils, supplemented by the beliefs they have inherited from the ages when as yet they were in unity with the Church Universal—which means that they are in substantial harmony with the Catholic Church on points of doctrine, except for their denial of the doctrine of Papal jurisdiction, and a few other points of detail, such as the nature of the Procession of the Holy Ghost, the words in the Mass which effect the consecration, the Immaculate Conception, the indissolubility of marriage, and one or two more ; as to which, however, it must not be forgotten that the Orthodox Churches have never defined any doctrines, or had the means of defining any, since 787, when the last of the seven Councils was terminated, so that all these points of variance from the creed of Catholicism are not the official doctrines of their Churches, but the opinions of certain parties which are not even consistent among themselves.

If, moreover, these autocephalous Churches are to so large an extent in agreement among themselves in their doctrinal system, it is quite otherwise as regards questions of jurisdiction. There is no court of appeal to which their disputes can be referred for final settlement, for certainly they would not accept the decisions of the

The Eastern Churches

Patriarch of Constantinople for such. The result is that they are torn by constant quarrels, which often lead to withdrawals of sacramental communion and the fostering of bitter animosities. Another thing, too, that is amiss with these autocephalous Churches is that for long past they have got into the way of sending their more promising candidates for the priesthood to German and other Protestant centres of education, forgetful that by so doing they were exposing them in their most formative age to Protestant influences, and yet when they return home choosing them for prelatures and places of importance, and thereby helping to spread through their whole communion the poison of rationalistic criticism, the sceptical temperament, and the individualism of thought which has made it necessary at all times to distinguish between the supposed teaching of their Church and the private opinions of the particular ecclesiastics.

It will be convenient here, whilst we are engaged in describing the different ecclesiastical communities that represent the Christian religion in the Near East, to include a list of the Uniat Churches, as they are called—that is to say, those communities which at one time or another since the separation of the eleventh century have returned to the communion of the Holy See, whilst continuing, with its full sanction, in the observance of their ancient liturgy and of their old customs, which include the marriage of the clergy of the second order, though requiring that the Bishops at least be celibate. These Uniat bodies correspond in number and species with the separatist communities that have been enumerated, inasmuch as it is from these respectively that they have parted off in order to return to Catholic unity. It will, however, be more satisfactory to describe them in an order more in keeping with their numerical and historical importance at the present time.

Let us put, then, in the first place among these Uniats those who are generally spoken of as the Ruthenian Uniats. These till rather more than a century ago numbered over twelve millions, perhaps more. They dwelt,

and the War

as their descendants do still, in the districts called Little, White, and Red Russia, or in the Province of Lithuania, where, however, they formed groups in many places rather than a population equally distributed over the whole region. Their metropolitan see was Kieff, in the Ukraine, and they had suffragan sees at Wladimir in Volhynia, Luzk, Brest, Chelm, Polock, Pinsk, Lemberg, and Przemysl. It will be noticed by those who have been following the course of the present war on its Eastern front that these are names that have been frequently mentioned in the reports, or marked in the maps published to indicate its scenes of action. In fact, it might without too much inaccuracy be said that the scenes of that Eastern campaign have lain almost wholly in the region once noted, or still noted, for these Uniat Churches. From the sixteenth to the end of the eighteenth centuries they were under the rule of the Kings of Poland, who were also Grand Dukes of Lithuania. The Ruthenian as distinguished from the Lithuanian section of these populations, on the other hand, would have sharply distinguished themselves from the natives of Greater Russia, whom they would have called not Russians, but Muscovites, they themselves claiming, not without reason, to be the original and genuine Russians, the nucleus around which the enormous modern empire has formed. For it is these Ruthenians who were the subjects of St Wladimir, converted along with him in the year 988 by the missionaries sent from Constantinople. This date is to be noted, for it means that, the Byzantine Church not having as yet fallen away finally into schism, neither were the Ruthenians involved in it through any action of their own or of their Byzantine patriarch. Indeed, even when, in the middle of the following century, the Byzantians fell away the Ruthenians, who lived so far off from the capital of the empire, took no formal step whereby they can be said to have identified themselves with it ; and it may be doubted whether till long afterwards they had any distinct consciousness of its existence as bearing on their own status. Still they were part of the Patriarchate of

The Eastern Churches

Constantinople, from which they received their Metropolitans, and with which they held the rare ecclesiastical intercourse which their ecclesiastical condition necessitated. In this way they drifted eventually into the schism.

In the fifteenth century, when the question of reunion was discussed at the Council of Florence, Isidore, the Metropolitan of Kieff, was one of the foremost advocates of the union, to the cause of which he remained faithful even when the Council was over and its decree had been rejected throughout the East. The warm reception which Isidore had on his return to Kieff testifies to the favour with which its people regarded the idea of reunion, but it was not till a century and a half later that they themselves took the step which reunited them with the Holy See. By that time the Ruthenian prelates had become deeply conscious of the degradation into which their Church had fallen through the decay of the Apostolic spirit, the prevalence of simony and other evils, from which the Patriarchs of Constantinople showed not only no disposition to deliver them, but even a disposition to make things worse. On the other hand, there were in the towns of Lithuania Bishops and clergy of the Latin rite side by side with the Orthodox, and these Latins exhibited, both in themselves and in their flocks, a spirituality and fervour that were in striking contrast with the demoralisation of the schismatics and could not but set the earnest among the latter deeply thinking. Accordingly the Ruthenian prelates held a synod at Brest in 1595, and resolved to send two of their number to Rome to lay their case before Clement VIII. These two received, as may be imagined, a warm welcome, and in their own name and that of the Bishops, clergy, and people who had sent them they made their profession of faith and were reconciled with the Roman Church. The one thing for which they asked—namely, that they might be allowed to keep their ancient rites and customs—was cordially granted by the Pope, in accordance with the precedent set at Florence. Why should they not be? They were

and the War

only asking to be allowed to live as St John Chrysostom, St Basil, St Flavian, and so many other saintly men had lived in the days anterior to the schism. On their return home the Ruthenian Bishops held another synod at Brest, at which their act was ratified by the formal acceptance of their brother prelates and clergy, at least of the majority of them.

Of course all did not go on smoothly. Many refused to abandon the schism in which they had been brought up. Political and personal interests were arrayed against the Uniats, who had a long and fierce conflict, lasting through more than one generation, before they could establish themselves on a secure footing and provide themselves with a well-trained body of clergy and religious to sustain them in their trial. But at length they did establish themselves, and grew and developed until at the end of the eighteenth century a fearful catastrophe overwhelmed them. The three partitions of Poland took place in 1772, 1793, and 1795, and resulted in far the larger portion of the former kingdom passing into the hands of Russia. Catharine II. was then on the throne, and, notwithstanding her solemn promise that she would respect the religious liberty of the Catholics of *both rites*, made at the Treaty of Lublin, she proceeded at once in the most cruel manner to force all these poor Uniats back into schism. Her hand pressed heavily on the Catholics of the Latin rite; but the rulers of Russia have ever felt a special spite against the Uniats of the Greek rite, just because their worship and customs are so closely assimilated to those of their own schismatic Church. The tale of the deceptions and violence practised on these unhappy people makes one's blood boil to read of, but by the end of her reign Catharine had succeeded, not in converting, but in suppressing every external manifestation of their religious feelings on the part of something like eight millions of her new subjects. On her death in 1796 her son, Paul I., succeeded. He was of a different mould from his mother, and did much to restore what she had destroyed. Three out of the suppressed Uniat bishoprics

The Eastern Churches

he reconstituted, those, namely, of Polock, which he got Pius VI. to raise into an archbishopric, Luzk, and Brest. His successor, Alexander I., pursued, on the whole, the same considerate policy. But when Nicholas I. came to the throne in 1825 the policy of persecution was resumed and carried out with even greater brutality than in the days of Catharine, the persecutors being in this instance, as in that of 1795, assisted by the craft and active co-operation of one or two apostate priests whom they made into bishops. For this persecution, too, a pretext was given by an insurrection that broke out in 1830, an insurrection sufficiently accounted for by the intolerably harsh rule to which the Poles were subjected. Very few of the Uniates took part in this insurrection, but its guilt was ascribed to them and their clergy generally. What form the dragonnades took on this occasion is attested for English readers by the official report of General Mansfield and Mr Webster, respectively the Consul-General and Vice-Consul at Warsaw at the time. These reports were published in a Blue Book issued in 1877.

But we must not linger on the details of these persecutions, instructive as they are, nor on those of Alexander II. during the period from 1863 to 1875, except to say that by the latter date, when the sole remaining see of Chelm was swept away, this Uniat Church, so far as the Russian dominions were in question, was entirely extinct—extinct, that is to say, in the sense that the Russian Government refused to recognize any that still claimed to belong to the Unia save as apostates from the State Church to which they had been thus forcibly annexed. In 1905, however, when, in consequence of the civil troubles that arose as a sequel to the Russo-Japanese War, complete liberty of conscience was at last proclaimed, a large number of these afflicted people took advantage of the opportunity to return openly to Catholic unity, taking, however, the precaution, as far as one can make out, to attach themselves now to the Latin rite. Many of the Russian Orthodox, who had not been Uniates

and the War

before, now joined them in taking refuge in the Latin rite.

In Galicia, which had fallen to the share of Austria in the course of the partitions, these Uniats, who number some two millions and a half, have been treated with fairness, and so have been able to follow their consciences and remain in the communion of the Holy See. But their existence so near to the Russian frontier has always been a grievance to the Russian Government, which has never ceased to work among them through its emissaries. And it is a feature of saddest omen in the present war that when for a time Russia obtained possession of that province, in spite of her solemn proclamation made at the commencement of the war that complete liberty would be granted to all the populations of the new and independent Poland that was projected, she at once proceeded to take their churches away from the Galician Uniats and give them over to the schismatics, to carry off Archbishop Scepticki of Lemberg and many of his clergy into exile and internment in the heart of Russia, and to drive the Uniat people themselves back into schism by promises and threats.*

To continue the account of the Uniat Churches one must add that, besides those in the Bukovina and Galicia, there are others—namely, those subject to the Sees of Munkacs and Eperies, in Hungary, and Kreutz, in the archiepiscopal province of Agram, in Croatia. There are also some Roumanian Uniats who use the Byzantine rite, but in a Roumanian version. These number about a million and a half, and have episcopal sees at Fogaras, Grosswardein, and Lugos, in Transylvania and the adjacent parts of Hungary. In the kingdom of Roumania there appear to be very few Uniats, and these without ecclesiastical organization. Further, there are some scattered groups of Uniats in Turkey Proper, and a few

* See on this point *L'Ukraine*, a little paper quite recently started and published at Lausanne, the purpose of which is to bring home to Western readers the conditions and aspirations of the Ukrainians, of whom these Galicians are a section.

The Eastern Churches

also in the kingdom of Greece, for the sake of whom a few Assumptionist Fathers have established missions at Constantinople and some places in its vicinity. Lastly, there are about 140,000 Uniats under a prelate who represents the three former patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. These are mostly scattered about Syria and Egypt.

To enter thoroughly into the mental attitude of the Orthodox in Russia towards reunion with the Latins, as they would call the adherents of the Holy See, it is necessary to bear in mind the historical antecedents, going back to the far past, from which they have inherited their present state of separation. When the Roman Emperors became Christian, and about the same time transferred their capital to the Golden Horn, it was inevitable that a Byzantine party should soon be formed. The Emperors themselves, speaking of them generally, could not resist the temptation to interfere authoritatively in the administration of the Church, far in excess of what could be legitimately conceded to their office ; and to aid them in this, which soon became a settled policy, they worked for the exaltation of the Bishop of Constantinople, the court bishop who was close at their side, to the dignity of a patriarch pre-eminent even over the older patriarchs, and second to none save only the Bishop of Rome, whose position was too securely safeguarded by the Divine promise to Blessed Peter, which at that time even the Byzantines did not venture to dispute. As the Popes, in the exercise of their supreme office, never failed to insist on preserving the purity of dogma and the fidelity of Church administration to the rule of the canons, whilst at Constantinople there was always a disposition to sacrifice these spiritual essentials to the exigencies of the politics of the moment, or of the personal desires of the court, frequent conflicts arose between the Holy See and these court patriarchs, which were embittered by the traditional and growing dislike of the Byzantines for the Latin race. It is attributable to this deep-rooted endeavour of the Byzantines to obtain at all times the mastery

and the War

that during the 506 years of interval between the death of Constantine the Great and the end of the Iconoclast heresy in the eighth century Constantinople was involved in schism for as much as 248 years by the heresy of nearly twenty of its patriarchs, and that as a consequence that sense of the necessity of Church unity which became so strong in the West was never much developed in the East.

In 867 Photius became by imperial appointment the *de facto* patriarch of Constantinople, and applied to Pope St Nicholas I., according to the accustomed routine—a fact which shows that he himself up to then was prepared to recognise Papal Supremacy over the whole Church—for the confirmation of his appointment. St Nicholas, after inquiry, refused this request on several grounds, the chief of which was that the previous Patriarch Ignatius was still living and had not been deposed by any competent authority. Photius responded by calling together what he called a general Council, which, under his dictation, deposed Pope St Nicholas on the plea that he, and with him the whole Western Church, had become immersed in grievous heresy. A few years later Photius himself fell into disgrace with a new Emperor, and after a short interval intercommunion with Rome was restored. Then things went on as before, except that Photius had left a fatal legacy behind him in the crystallization of the anti-Latin spirit into that of a definite party which kept alive the desire for relapse into the state of separation. The opportunity of this influential party came about a century and a half later. Michael Cerularius was then on the patriarchal throne. There was, indeed, at the time not a breath of dispute between the Holy See and the Emperor Constantine Monomachus, but on the contrary a specially friendly spirit cemented by the circumstances of the time, as each needed the assistance of the other to repel a Norman invasion of Southern Italy. But Constantine Monomachus was at this time a broken-down paralytic, and Cerularius was the master-spirit of the empire. Accord-

The Eastern Churches

ingly he renewed the old charge of Photius that the West was involved in heresy, and on this ground forced on the separation which, except for one or two momentary and partial renewals of intercommunion, at Lyons in 1274 and Florence in 1439, has persisted ever since. But the whole story is long and complicated. We may be permitted, therefore, to refer the reader to Cardinal Hergenröther's great work entitled *Photius*, which explores the subject very thoroughly from every side, with absolute impartiality and full dependence on the relevant documents; or for a shorter and more accessible account by a competent writer, Dr Adrian Fortescue's *Orthodox Eastern Churches* may be consulted. Each of these writers also collects testimonies which prove how complete was the recognition by the Eastern Church of the Divine origin of the supremacy of the Apostolic See in the days previous to the schism.

We have referred to the motives alleged by Photius and Michael Cerularius as justifying their secession from the communion of the Apostolic See. What cannot but strike one in the lists of grievances against the Western Church set forth by these two prelates is their trivial and casual character. Photius, in his letter to the Eastern Bishops when he invited them to meet and depose St Nicholas I, gave the following five: that the Latins compel their people to fast on Saturdays, that they allow milk and cheese to be eaten during the first week in Lent (he means during the first two days after Quinquagesima Sunday), that they despise married priests, that they do not acknowledge the validity of confirmation when administered by priests instead of bishops, that they corrupt the Creed by inserting in it the *Filioque*. In a letter written about the same time to the newly converted King of the Bulgarians he adds these others: that the Latins prepare their chrism from running water, that sometimes by the side of the Body and Blood of Christ they place a lamb on the altar which they consecrate and offer up, that they allow their priests to shave their beards, that they ordain deacons to the episcopate without passing them through

and the War

the priesthood ; to which Nicholas adds, in sending these lists to Hincmar of Rheims, that they pass all measure in maintaining that the transference of the imperial residence involved the transference to the see of Constantinople of all the prerogatives of the See of Rome. In these lists, it should be observed, no mention is made of the Latin custom of using unleavened bread for the Mass, as opposed to the Oriental custom of using leavened bread. But in 1054 Cerularius put this in the forefront of his charges against the Latins, another proof of the unreal, haphazard nature of these Oriental grievances. Of all these charges, however, some are false, as that the Westerns make, or ever did make, their chrism of water whether running or still, that they ever put lambs on the altar and attempted to consecrate them, or that they hold that under no circumstances can simple priests give confirmation. Others are mere matters of usage which can prevail lawfully in one region and not in another. The question whether there can be valid consecration to the episcopate without previous reception of the priesthood is an open question in theology, either view being considered tenable, and the few facts which underlie the dispute not being above doubt. The suggestion that the prerogatives of the Holy See were transferred to Constantinople along with the seat of empire indicates a position at which the Byzantines seem to have been aiming, as is witnessed by the canons they succeeded in bringing forward at the Second and Fourth Ecumenical Councils; but they never ventured to claim more, theoretically, on this alleged ground than that Constantinople came next after Rome in hierarchical rank, and in any case this Byzantine theory has destroyed itself altogether now that the old Eastern Empire has long since passed away. Indeed the ancient grievances may most of them be regarded as obsolete.

The Orthodox of the present day, unless they wished to make out grievances for the sake of making them out, would probably not find much difficulty in tolerating in the Westerns the customs which nine centuries ago

The Eastern Churches

Photius and Cerularius declared to be so intolerable, provided they were left free, as they would be, to retain among themselves all their own ancient usages of discipline and worship, those only excepted which might be deemed incompatible with the purity of Catholic dogma. And the lengthy debates which took place at the Council of Florence have at least proved this: that the differences between the two systems that bear on points of dogma are due more to misunderstandings on the Eastern side as to what the Westerns mean by some of their dogmas than to any more fundamental causes. In short, the only serious difficulties outstanding between the Holy See and the theologians of the Orthodox Church are as to the Divine origin of the Petrine supremacy, a doctrine which the ancient Greek saints and councils fully acknowledged, and the persistence among them of the quite unfounded suspicion that the Popes would wish to change their rites.

We are now in a position to consider what prospects there may be of after-war conditions tending in any way towards the healing of this extensive and deep-rooted schism—that is to say, we have the facts of the present moment, and the historical antecedents of which they are the outcome, sufficiently before us. We must not, however, forget how difficult it is to prognosticate the future of a movement of this kind which, if it is to be set going at all, must take place among a people with whose inner life we cannot get into direct touch, whose literature is closed on account of the difficulty of the language to all but a very few of us, and whose views of life, whose sympathies and antipathies, whose modes of judging and acting, whose mentality, in short, are so different from any we have experience of in the West. Inferences drawn under such conditions cannot be very sure, but they may suffice to stimulate interest in the subject and direct it to some of the points by which the religious movement in Russia and the Near East is likely to be determined as soon as the scourge of war has been laid aside and the world has returned to tasks of peaceful reconstruction.

and the War

We must own at once that all the indications seem to us to predict, as the likely after-results of this war, not any advance, but rather a set-back, in the cause of reunion. It is true that after an upheaval like the present many things may be expected to happen which are in the teeth of present tendencies rather than in accordance with them. But improbable eventualities are in the hands of God's providence, and cannot be made the subject of human calculations. On the other hand, so far as we can base any calculations on present tendencies, it is surely difficult to descry the signs of an incoming tide making for reunion between the Catholic Church and the bodies now separated from her in the East. If while the war was still undecided Russia could treat the Galician Uniats as she has done, because (as was evidently her motive) she feared lest the proximity of a Church united with the See of Rome, but otherwise so like her own in its rites and usages, should tend to have what she considered an injurious effect on her own people, how is it conceivable that, when the war is over, she should be prepared to negotiate for a similar submission to the Holy See on the part of the entire Orthodox communion ?

But is this opposition to reunion to be attributed only to the Russian bureaucracy acting under the influence of political motives, or does it reflect faithfully the feelings of the religious-minded among the Russian people generally ? And if so, must it be anticipated that the latter will continue always in this same mind ? This is a question well worthy of consideration, but the difficulty of considering it profitably lies in the ignorance of the Russian language and literature which is so general among the people of the West. Perhaps the war may in this one way contribute indirectly to promote the end we have at heart. Its effect will surely be to bring Russia and her Allies in the West into closer relations of business and social intimacy, and it may be hoped, therefore, that it will stimulate many of our Catholics over here to make themselves familiar with the Russian language and Russian literature ; perhaps also to induce

The Eastern Churches

those who are able to visit Russia more, to study its ways of thinking and acting, and so to gain a sure insight into its inner spirit—its *âme*, as the French would say. Inter-course of this kind, if sufficiently extended and prolonged, must tend to cultivate mutual understandings, and so to remove the prejudices and allay the suspicions which appear to be the most potent of the obstacles in the way of a religious reconciliation.

Meanwhile, if we are to estimate with some approach to correctness the religious tendencies at work among the Russian people at the present time, we must look through the eyes of others who have seen for themselves. Two books may be recommended as particularly useful in this respect. The first is Père Gagarin's *Le Clergé Russe*, of which an English translation was brought out in 1872. Père Gagarin, S.J., was of Russian birth and a convert from Orthodoxy to Catholicism. His book is a little ancient now, and allowance must be made for subsequent modifications in the system under which the Russian clergy live. But substantially the condition of this clergy remains what it became when brought under the preposterous regime inaugurated by Peter the Great, thereby illustrating the evil effects which can result from Church administration undertaken by princes and statesmen who, having no call from God to intervene in spiritual affairs, are unable to gauge the spiritual tendency of their measures. Père Gagarin gives a searching analysis of the state of the clergy of his own country, and shows how its grievous shortcomings are directly attributable to Peter the Great's deplorable legislation. The White, or secular, clergy not permitted only, as was the ancient custom in the East, but compelled to marry; their children compelled to be brought up in ecclesiastical schools, isolated from all contact with the children of the laity, their sons compelled to adopt the clerical life and their daughters to become the wives of the clergy; these ecclesiastical schools controlled, not by the Bishops, but by the Holy Synod, or rather by its Chief Procurator, the *personnel* of their teaching staff not unfre-

and the War

quently leavened by laymen, and even by Protestants or rationalists, chosen for their educational acquirements, but left free to exercise an unchecked influence on their young and inexperienced pupils ; the White clergy cut off altogether from hopes of promotion because only celibates can become Bishops, forced into the clerical state whether with or without vocation, and hence living in it without the needful spiritual dispositions, without pastoral zeal or pastoral care, content to regard their work as sufficiently done by a cold formal discharge of the church services and occasional ministrations, without the affection or veneration of their flocks, poverty-stricken if in the country places, and weighed down by the necessity of providing for their families, prone to seek in drunkenness some relief from the weariness of their hard and unsought-for lot—what can be expected save religious degradation from such clergy under such conditions ? And then the Black clergy, drawn into the monasteries not from any sense of vocation, but rather by the hopes of eventual promotion to the episcopate, to which it is the only avenue ; life in the monastery devoid of those spiritual helps and regular observances which impart charm and efficacy to the zeal and apostolic enterprise of the Catholic religious orders. And then, again, a standing jealousy between the White and the Black clergy, as a logical result of the artificial barriers that have been set up between them, an absolute want of sympathy shown or interest taken in the work of the White clergy by their Bishops, an alienation of feeling directly promoted by the Synodal system, the Synod not only appointing Bishops who are ready to be its servile instruments, but usurping their episcopal office of ruling their dioceses, leaving them none of that initiative which has so much to do with cementing the mutual spirit of fatherly care and filial loyalty which is the normal relation between them in the Catholic Church. Père Gagarin himself points out that from these evil institutions enforced upon the Russian Church it must not be inferred that the Russian clergy as a whole is thus injuri-

The Eastern Churches

ously affected. The spirit of God will see to it that in every country, especially in one which has valid sacraments and an ancient Christian tradition, good and fervent men and women will be found leavening the mass. And there is plenty of testimony to the working of this fine leaven among the Russian people, among their prelates, their clergy, secular and monastic, and their laity, poor and well-to-do. The only question can be as to the relative proportions of the two elements, and proportion is the hardest thing to judge of in one's estimates of a distant and largely sealed country.

These evils in the present condition of the Russian Church have been long felt and deplored by the Russians themselves, and have been commonly attributed to the injurious influence of the system of government by a Holy Synod dominated by its Chief Procurator. A desire in consequence has been long cherished for the convocation of a national Council, constituted on canonical principles, which should abolish the synodal system with its Erastian taint, revive the Patriarchate of Moscow, which Peter the Great did not formally suppress but only left indefinitely vacant, and should restore the government of the national Church to the Bishops acting under the headship of the Patriarch. In 1905 this desire found expression in a *memorandum* drawn up by some priests of Petrograd, which, in spite of the opposition of Pobiedonostzev, then the Chief Procurator, succeeded in obtaining the support of the Metropolitan Antonius of Petrograd, of Count de Witte, then Chancellor of the Empire, and so finally of the Tsar. The original idea was that the Council should be opened the following year, but the political troubles of the time made that impossible, and besides a work of preparation was felt to be necessary to deliberate on the constitution that should be given to the Council, as well as on the subjects it should be invited to consider. Accordingly a preparatory Commission was established by imperial rescript, and was staffed by the three Metropolitans of Petrograd, Moscow, and Kieff, by seven other diocesan prelates,

and the War

by some ten professors or rectors of the Universities or Spiritual Academies, and by some seven laymen distinguished for their proficiency in canon law or other sacred sciences. This preparatory Commission commenced its sittings in the spring of 1906, and continued them for about a year. By arrangement its proceedings were regularly reported in the *Tzerkovnyia Vedomosti*, the organ of the Holy Synod, besides which they were discussed and criticized with much frankness by many of the Petrograd newspapers and other publications, each of which weighed them from the standpoint of its own views and principles. In the spring of 1907 the conclusions reached by the preparatory Commission were proclaimed by ukase and made, so far as the authority of the civil sovereign could make them, the rule which was to govern the proceedings of the Council when it met; but no date for its meeting was intimated, nor has it met so far. Of course it could not meet during the war; perhaps it may meet some day after peace has been restored; but whether it will effect any salutary improvements may be doubted, for what the proceedings of the preparatory Commission have brought out is that fundamental differences of opinion prevail among the members of the present Orthodox Church of Russia, and that it is impossible to control this clash of ideals for want of a unifying authority able to show sufficient evidence of its legitimate spiritual character to be recognized as able to bind consciences.

But the insight into the prevailing character of Orthodox thought which this brief lifting of the curtain has revealed with such clearness to the outer world is the really valuable outcome of the work of this preparatory Commission. And here appears the utility of the second book we suggest as deserving to be read by students of Eastern Christianity—namely, Padre Aurelio Palmieri's *Chiesa Russa*, published at Florence in 1908. Padre Palmieri is an Augustinian Father known for his familiarity with the Russian language and as one deeply read in Russian literature. He has devoted many years of his

The Eastern Churches

life to this Eastern religious question, has spent much time among the Easterns in Russia and elsewhere, and has been welcomed and assisted by Russians of all classes, Orthodox and others, including those who were in a position to give him the most authentic information. His *Chiesa Russa* was written during the time when the preparatory Commission was engaged in its work and was constantly under the cross-fire of its critics, and the book is itself just a record of the movement out of which the Commission grew and of the discussion of its *acta*; and we may add that its insight and impartiality have been recognised by competent critics almost on every side—as may be seen from the inserted pages, giving the text of many of the book-notices upon it, that are appended to the author's later work, *Theologia dogmatica Orthodoxa*, published in 1911. Moreover, it is not only his personal judgments that he invites his readers to accept, but he sets before them copious and extensive extracts and abstracts of what was said by the representatives of the different parties in the debates of the preparatory Commission or the articles in the newspapers and pamphlets. Hence in Padre Palmieri's pages we have the present state of the Russian Church drawn to the life, and Père Gagarin's descriptions brought up to date. There, too, we see the confusion of ideas that the prospect of the Council has evoked, the hopeless disagreement as to who should compose it, whether the Bishops only, according to the ancient canonical rule, or the priests as well should be represented and how; and if the priests as well, whether representatives of the laity should not also be included. We see, again, what sort of standards of belief and of Church action would be pressed on the Council by these different sections; how the Bishops and representatives of the Black monks would stand for the traditional Church principles, the representatives of the White clergy for such ultra-radical measures as the abolition of a special clerical dress, of days of fasting and abstinence, or even of the general principles of spirituality and asceticism; whilst the laity would go even beyond that, and plead

and the War

that there should be perfect liberty for clergy and laity to hold and advocate, without sacrificing any of their religious privileges, the destructive doctrines of modern rationalism. This can be learnt on the surest authority by a reader of Padre Palmieri's pages, but it would be impossible to epitomize it here at the end of an article.

All this, it may be said, is to the bad. How, then, can it be considered to hold out hopes that a reunion movement will be likely to arise in Russia as an effect of the war? True, we have expressed our doubts whether that can be anticipated. But the point is this. Four things seem to be the prerequisites to the growth of such a reunion movement, and the question is how far the war or other causes now at work will prove to have hastened on the realization of these prerequisites. Let us consider them.

First, liberty of conscience must be secured to all. This, though proclaimed in 1905, was no doubt largely recalled very soon afterwards, and was recalled because the interval of toleration had shown how many apparent members of the national Church had been forced into a state of existence against which their consciences rebelled. How can persons so situated be expected to become conscientious members of that Church? How can they be expected to add strength to the empire? Almost everywhere in these days liberty of conscience is secured to all by law. Is it never to be so in Russia? May it not be hoped that, at least after the sad experience of the effects of persecution which its treatment of Galicia has brought to the Government of Russia, it will learn that toleration is the best policy?

Secondly, a more friendly feeling between Easterns and Westerns should be generated and should lead to their understanding one another better, to the laying aside of prejudices and suspicions for which there is really no foundation. May not this, at least, be an outcome of the war? If the Uniats could be restored to their previous state, which would seem to be an essential consequence if religious freedom is restored after this war as it

The Eastern Churches

was after the Russo-Japanese War, then the example of these Uniats so close at hand would be a powerful instrument for the extinction of these suspicions, as will in any case be the example of the Uniats under other sovereignties in the East, and perhaps also the example of those in the United States, where both sections, the Uniats and the Orthodox, have begun to colonize during the last three decades, and where they are always able to meet one another undisturbed.

Thirdly, the Russian Orthodox should become keenly conscious of the sad state to which their national Church has by now been reduced, and should be brought to realize the extent to which this falling off is due to their lack of any effective unifying authority. And it is just this that the public discussions incident to the holding of the preparatory Commission have brought so forcibly home to them.

Fourthly, they should be led to see that the only direction in which such an effective unifying authority can be sought with success is in the See of Peter. Vladimir Soloviev, who was gradually brought to this conviction by the study of Eastern authorities, saw this clearly.

"Since neither the Patriarch of Constantinople," he wrote in his *La Russie et l'Eglise universelle*,

nor the Synod of Petersburg have or could have the pretensions to represent the *rock* of the universal Church—that is, the real and fundamental unity of ecclesiastical power—one must either renounce the state of unity altogether, and accept that of division, disorder, and servitude as the normal state of the Church, or recognize the rights and the true value of the *one* and *only* power in existence which has shown itself to be the centre of ecclesiastical unity. No reasoning can suppress the evidence of the fact that outside Rome there are only national Churches (as the Armenian and the Greek) or State Churches (as the Russian or the English), or sects founded by individuals (as Lutherans, Calvinists, Irvingites, etc.). The Catholic Church is the only one which is neither a national Church nor a State Church, nor a sect founded by a man. It is the sole Church in the world which preserves and affirms the principle of universal social liberty,

and the War

as against the egotism of individuals and the particularism of nations. It is the only one which preserves and affirms the liberty of the spiritual power as against State absolutism. It is the only one, in short, against which the gates of hell have not prevailed.

The loss of Soloviev, who died in 1900, was the loss of one who, had he lived, might have done much to awaken in the minds of his fellow-countrymen the desire for reconciliation. But his influence in Russia is said to be still great. May one not gather that there are many devout and acute minds there who are thinking these same thoughts ? At all events, let us hope so ; for one thing seems to be certain. This is a time of crisis for Russia's Church. Before her is the alternative of strengthening herself in her ancient Catholic life and opening her lungs to the revivifying influences that breathe forth from the Apostolic See, or hardening herself in a resistance which must end in delivering over her people to the disintegrating forces of modern rationalism.

SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J.

SOME RECENT BOOKS

¶ Under this heading will be noticed a limited number of books to which the Editor is unable to devote one of the longer articles, but desires, for one reason or another, to call attention.

IT was a bold task to attempt illustrations of Newman's *Dream of Gerontius* (The Bodley Head, 3s. 6d. net), but Miss Langdale has scored a genuine success in a most difficult attempt. The illustrations are the work of one who has entered with keen perception into the genius of the work. Mr. Gordon Tidy prefixes to them an interesting account of the origin of the poem. He disposes satisfactorily of the myth that it was consigned by Newman to the wastepaper basket. But he quotes Aubrey de Vere's testimony to the fact that it had been pigeon-holed and practically forgotten by Newman until Father Coleridge asked him for some contribution to the *Month* :

He looked into all his pigeon-holes and found nothing theological, but in answering his correspondent he added that he had come upon some verses which, if as editor he cared to have, were at his command.

Thus the poem was published in the *Month* in April and May, 1865. It seems most probable that the vivid presentiment of death of which we read in his Biography and which was described in a memorandum dated Passion Sunday, 1864, led to the writing of the poem, and Mr. Tidy points to internal evidence to this effect. As to the origin of the name Gerontius, which seems to have led to some discussion, there can be little doubt that Newman only meant that it was the dream of an old man to whom death was inevitably a near prospect. We cannot agree with Mr. Jaeger's words quoted by Mr. Tidy that Gerontius was an ordinary man and a sinner who, after leading a worldly man's life, is now near to death and repentant. It seems to us pretty clear from

The History of England

the whole poem that Gerontius was a man of pious and Christian life, though Alfred Austin is hardly warranted in assuming that he was a monk.

W. W.

THE eleventh volume of *The History of England* (By John Lingard, D.D., and Hilaire Belloc, B.A. Sands and Co. pp. 729. 16s. net) has been eagerly awaited. Lingard himself had written in the advertisement to his first volume :—

The historian ought not to confine himself to the barren recital of facts. It is his duty to trace the silent progress of nations from barbarism to refinement ; and to mark their successive improvements in the arts of legislation and government. But in the performance of this duty he must keep a steady rein on the imagination, or he will mistake fiction for truth and write a romance in the place of a history.

We begin by congratulating Mr. Belloc upon the success with which he has written history in accordance with these principles of Lingard. There are lapses and failings here and there, but as a whole the book is a worthy conclusion to the great work. Mr. Belloc's judgments are definite and strong, his writing is vigorous and clear, and he makes no attempt to write with that languid so-called impartiality which leaves the reader wondering what the writer himself really does think on any question. There is never any doubt as to what Mr. Belloc thinks. He never hesitates to put forward his own views and to emphasise what he considers to be important in fact and in explanation. For this reason the volume will probably not be popular ; but it is good historical work, for all that.

He has given us a history of England from 1688 to 1910 which, so far as we can tell, is correct in its statements of fact, and catholic and truthful in its explanations. He is seen at his best when writing the history of military movements, and his summary of the American War of Independence makes a war which most English histories treat confusedly clear and intelligible to all readers. Ire-

Some Recent Books

land, too, has not been treated so fairly, we think, in any other English history as it is in this one. The reader is made to realise what was the state of the country, how iniquitous were the laws under which the Irish suffered, and how miraculous was the survival of the Irish race and faith in spite of it all.

There are views boldly expressed with which many readers will not agree. For instance :

We live to-day in a time when the Catholic Church is triumphing in Europe after long peril. No educated man seriously thinks of religion save in terms of the Catholic Church or its negation. The last of the great heresies is obviously failing. . . . To put it in one sentence : A Catholic to-day turning renegade for a worldly purpose looks a fool. In those days (George II.) the Catholic seemed a fool for standing firm.

The reader will either like or strongly dislike judgments of this sort. He will probably find it difficult to remain neutral on the point. The only sentence we have discovered which strikes us as unlike the view of a Catholic is that in which he speaks of Wolfe Tone's death (p. 388) : " He was taken to Dublin, condemned to death, and with characteristic courage killed himself to avoid the shame of execution."

The most doubtful feature of the book from the student's point of view is the absence of all references. This is intelligible, in view of the known views of modern publishers, but one cannot help feeling that references are still necessary to any good history. Lingard gave them page by page as they occurred, and the absence of them in this last volume is a serious defect. Would it not be a good plan to give all references in a few extra pages at the end of the volume ? This was done by Andrew Lang in his book, *The Maid of France*, and the method seems satisfactory to publishers and readers alike. There are occasional misprints—e.g., " In the January of 1690 " (p. 45) should be 1699 ; and the title-page promises an introduction by Cardinal Gibbons which does not occur, at least in the volume we have.

Economic History of England

But the views of Mr. Belloc most likely to cause controversy and criticism are those on modern England. He tells us that the future of England depends on whether or no the power of the Crown can be revived once more ; that Englishmen are divided into a capitalist minority and a proletariat majority ; that the whole tendency is for the proletariat to be compelled by law to labour for the profit of the few ; that, in brief, we are approaching the full effects of the Reformation after four hundred years in the permanent and secure re-establishment of economic conditions, which, by whatever terms the process may be marked, will be in essence servile. These are grave judgments, necessarily personal and strong, and likely, as Mr. Belloc admits, to differ in many points from those of many of his readers. He begs the readers to believe that the judgments are not only sincere but are based upon a varied and considerable experience of the realities hidden behind the façade of our politics. And, whether we agree with these judgments or not, we may at least congratulate Mr. Belloc on having sincerely acted up to the principles which Lingard set in the forefront of the first volume of his history.

THE first volume, dealing with the Middle Ages, of Mr. E. Lipson's *Introduction to the Economic History of England* (A. and C. Black. pp. 552. 7s. 6d. net) is a careful and successful piece of work. It states fairly the problems of medieval economic history, distinguishes clearly between what is known for certain and what historians have conjectured, summarises admirably the arguments of rival Schools, and indicates wherever a conclusion is possible. The special value of the work arises from the fact that the author makes use of much material which has only recently become available, and his researches tend to modify certain conclusions on which economic historians have hitherto generally insisted. The self-sufficiency of the medieval manor, for instance, or the lack of opportunity to employ borrowed capital are notions familiar enough to the student of

Some Recent Books

economic history ; but he will perhaps feel less sure of them after reading Mr. Lipson's book. Especially good is his chapter on the craft gilds, which, although containing practically nothing on the religious side of gild life, is about as complete a summary of the history of gilds as one could desire. The references to authorities given on every page will be a great help to students, though we cannot help saying that Prof. Ashley's method of giving short notes on the authorities at the beginning of each chapter, indicating their date, writer, scope and value, is far more valuable to the student than a bare list of authorities such as Mr. Lipson gives.

Throughout the book there is the strict adherence to the economic point of view, disregarding religion and morality as not the economist's concern, so characteristic of English economists ; and this may make the book valuable to the student preparing for English examinations. But the student's outlook would be wider and the author's judgments would correspond more closely to the realities of life if in considering usury laws, craft gilds, and other medieval institutions, they grasped the fact that the medieval world was Christian and Catholic in its economics as in other things. Economics apart from the Christian religion did not exist. Conditions of labour, terms of contracts, earning of money, were not regulated by economic conditions only, but by the Catholic Church as well. And no one can properly understand medieval history, whether political or economic, without first understanding much of the Catholic Church, its position and authority, and its general acceptance in the medieval world.

T. W.

ROYALIST *Father and Roundhead Son* (By Cecilia, Countess of Denbigh. Methuen. pp. 323. 12s. 6d. net) is one of those compilations, largely made from private family records, which are so often of great value to the historian. It gives us the story of the two first Earls of Denbigh, who lived in the stormy period of the Civil

Royalist Father

War and the Commonwealth. The Feildings had been country gentlemen for two centuries and more before that time, living at Newnham lives which were, no doubt, useful and creditable but not very distinguished. The rise of the family to national importance was really due to the marriage of William Feilding in 1607 to Susan Villiers, the sister of the future favourite of James I., George Villiers, the first Duke of Buckingham, of whom more than of any other man in English history it may be said with truth that "his face was his fortune." The Feildings rose in the wake of the Villiers, and it was at the new Duke's request that his brother-in-law was made Earl of Denbigh. His life after his advancement was an interesting one. He went to Spain with "Steenie and Baby Charles" for the wooing of the Infanta, and served in the Navy in various attempts to relieve Rochelle, the last of which he commanded. But, like the Dardanelles, the entrance to Rochelle had been rendered "impregnable by reason of the ordnance planted on both sides and the triple palisade erected within." Moreover, the ships were "so ill provided that their victuals stank." Naturally, the expeditions failed as the others had done, and the Rochellois at last, in despair of help, surrendered to the French King.

The Earl's next journey was much further afield, for he was sent to the East on a diplomatic mission to the King of Persia and the Great Mogul. Such a journey at that period must have been full of interest, but we are told little about it, except that he came back in safety in 1632, after a comparatively short absence, to find the beginnings in England of the political troubles between the King and Parliament which were to lead later on to such terrible results. Here we are brought to the tragedy which gives the title to the book. The first Earl was essentially a courtier, owing all his position to the favour of the King, and giving faithful service in return for the furtherance of his patron's interests. But his heir had imbibed other notions, although his early life had also been passed at the Court, and he had held great positions, such as Ambassa-

Some Recent Books

dor Extraordinary to Savoy. It was probably the contrast between the government of Venice and that of Savoy that led him to take sides, when the storm burst, with the Parliament and against the King. At the Battle of Edgehill father and son were both present on opposite sides, though they were spared the crowning agony of actually meeting in the course of the battle. A year later the first Earl fell at Birmingham, and his son was summoned under a flag of truce to see his father, but arrived too late to see him alive. It is a tragedy which has its counterpart in every Civil War, and one can imagine no more heartrending situation. Lady Denbigh has done well to put the story together out of the treasures of the family archives at Newnham Paddox.

A. B.

MESSRS. BURNS & OATES have done well to republish the late Mr. T. W. Allies' *Journal in France and Letters from Italy* (pp. 379. 6s. net). The book was originally published in 1849, between the conversions of Newman and Manning, and being regarded as inconsistent with the author's position as a beneficed clergyman of the Church of England was bought up soon after publication, so that it became rare. It is of considerable value as a vivid picture of the Church in France, Tyrol and Italy of that date, as it appeared to a disciple of Newman, soon about to follow his master's example and himself become a Catholic. Of especial interest are the letters which give one of the most detailed accounts we have seen anywhere in English of those two remarkable instances of a mystical union with the Passion resulting in physical phenomena, known as l'Addolorata and l'Estatica of the Tyrol. The book was worth republishing for these letters alone, which give the impressions made on three separate eye-witnesses of the phenomena in question. They agree in noting the singular detail that the blood which flowed from the wounds of the Addolorata every Friday did not follow the natural course which the laws of gravity would impose, but flowed as it

Conduct and the Supernatural

would have done had she been hanging on a cross instead of lying upon the bed. "The blood flows in a straight line all down the face, as if she were erect, not as it would naturally flow from the position in which she was lying, that is off the middle to the side of the face. And what is strangest of all there is a space all round the face, from the forehead down to the jaw, by the ears, quite free from blood, and of the natural colour : which is just that part to which the blood, as she lies, ought most to run." "The darkest spot of all was the tip of the nose, a spot which, as she was lying, the blood in its natural course could not reach at all." The doctor in attendance assured them that "he had seen the wounds on the feet a hundred times, and that the blood flowed upwards towards the toes, as we saw it did on the nose." It is a phenomenon, writes Mr. Allies, "which sets at utter defiance all physical science, and which seems to me a direct exertion of Almighty power and of that alone."

A. B.

IT is a pleasure to be able to welcome whole-heartedly a book of Apologetic by one of our Anglican friends, for so often, even when one is in substantial agreement, the divergent point of view, or the handling of some one section, makes full acceptance impossible. Mr Lionel Spencer Thornton, of the Mirfield Community, in his Norrisonian Prize Essay upon *Conduct and the Supernatural* (Longmans. Pp. xiv, 327. 7s. 6d. net), puts us under the necessity of no such reservations. True, there is one line of thought which, after certain recent Roman decisions about the New Testament, a writer among ourselves would have remoulded, and a few other and similar points will be noticed by the close reader—but they are unsubstantial and innocent. The larger, and the only, doubt we have about Mr. Thornton's work is whether it was really worth while to cast a long, carefully wrought and deeply pondered defence of supernatural and Christian ethics into the form of a detailed examination of such clay idols of a passing hour as the

Some Recent Books

works of John Davidson, Shaw, Wells, and H. S. Chamberlain. Nietzsche, who is brilliantly and freshly estimated, is, of course, of importance enough; equally of course—to our mind—an absurd book of some notoriety, already we fancy out of sale, was not worth the lengthy and deferential attention paid to it, even as a text for one the best expositions and defences of “the Otherworldly principle” in ethics we have ever read. But perhaps Mr. Thornton is right; at least, the Norrisonian adjudicators seem to have thought so in proposing as subject, “Christian Ideals and Modern Reactions from Them.” After all, it is not much use assuring the younger generation that the “Modern Reactions” have very little that is new in them except their form, and will pass away, as Dr. Liddon said, “like the fashions of a lady’s dress.” Many of ourselves were perhaps bitten with the Matthew Arnold mania in the ’seventies, or the Ibsen mania in the ’eighties, and even if we are now old enough not to be taken in again, we can remember that we once were young. And so we may well believe that there is a valuable timeliness in a first-rate apologetic work, which our young people will read throughout with a flattered sense of being *dans le mouvement*, and which will give them the comfortable feeling of being on terms with Shaw, Wells and their like, while all the time they are imbibing the antidote. For ourselves, we are resigned to the boredom of so much Wells and Shaw, for the sake of the very interesting and satisfactory Thornton we get in between. We only ask that the author will soon give us another book, all his own.

We confess that Mr Thornton interests us in yet another way. We feel we are in touch with a soul *naturaliter Christiana*, naturally Catholic. Mr Thornton always goes, as if by instinct, to the root of the matter, fastens upon the essential point with the grip of certitude. We have failed to find any practical point, in a long essay on practical living, in which he does not go straight for the real thing, or in which he surrenders an iota to the modern fetishes of compromise or revolt.

Belief and Practice

Socialism, political morality, marriage, the ascetic principle, the "other-worldly principle"—all are handled, not only in substance but, in tone, as a Catholic would handle them, and yet with a deep appreciation of the needs of the non-Catholic mind. We have noticed but two substantial references to Catholicism as a system, in our sense, but they are both significant—particularly that which occurs in the course of a defence of those principles in regard to marriage and sex upon which even the best Anglicans are too often prone to compromise, while almost universally, outside her bounds, the Church is considered hopelessly obscurantist. Mr. Thornton is, we believe, a young writer; he is certainly one of a promise which has already in this book shown fulfilment; he has a competent, in many respects a brilliant, equipment; he has apologetic zeal, and he has the right standpoint. We invite him, before he writes further, to ask himself one or two plain questions. Where does he find the lofty ethical ideals to which he pledges himself alone consistently, authoritatively and corporately maintained; and why? What living voice will he find to-day which alone will venture to teach, as one having authority, what he teaches; and why? Along what line of divergence from that point does he trace, alike in history and in present conditions, a progressive decline from that standard, in every stage from halting speech to direct negation and revolt; and why?

FROM the University Press at Cambridge comes Mr Will Spens' *Belief and Practice* (Longmans & Co. pp. xii, 244. 6s. net). Ever since the days of Westcott a certain learned obscurity has been the distinguishing mark of Cambridge theology. One recalls Dr Liddon's explanation of a London fog, that it was "believed to be due to Dr Westcott having opened his study window at Westminster." Mr Spens has all the obscurity of his school, while the learning is not so plainly apparent. Since in his estimation the basis on which Christianity is built is not satisfactory, he sets out to provide something

Some Recent Books

better, and, discarding all such old-fashioned ideas as the Inspiration of the Bible or the Infallibility of the Church, seeks his new foundation in the religious experience of large numbers of people, and, by a careful manipulation of his evidence, comes happily to the conclusion that he is right in holding just so much of the Catholic faith as he at present wishes and no more. So elastic a foundation can always be compressed or extended to suit any needs. Not that the plan leads to holding anything at all firmly. Mr Spens is careful, for instance, to tell us that when he says he believes in a Personal God he

merely means that we affirm a less inadequate account of the totality of experience by asserting that there is a Being who has the experience of being God, or the experience which that phrase suggests to us, than if we deny that statement or fail to make it.

The whole structure thus built up may perhaps hold together for a few years in the sheltered atmosphere of a College room, but if ever Mr Spens ventures out into more stormy regions and has to face the realities of the world he will find, we fear, that he has indeed built his house upon the sand. We have some sympathy with the author, whose object is constructive and not destructive, but his method is not satisfactory. Experience is valuable to confirm what is already believed on other grounds, but it cannot itself provide a firm foundation.

After the elaborate and verbose obscurity of this book it is a relief to turn to Father Finlay's *The Church of Christ* (Longmans & Co. pp. xii, 264. 2s. 6d. net). These are the inaugural lectures delivered at Dublin by the learned Jesuit as Professor of Theology in the National University. It is not indeed quite what we have come to expect from the inaugural lectures of a University Professor. There is no show of deep learning, no attempt to carry research into unfamiliar fields, no novel treatment of some burning subject of the day. Instead we have only one of the most fundamental of all questions, treated very much on the old lines, but with a clarity and conciseness which is beyond praise. The book will be invaluable

Apotheosis and After Life

for all enquirers and searchers after truth, and is a real and permanent addition to our apologetic literature. The last lecture, which deals with the "Authority of Bishops," is especially valuable and useful. Too often Catholic writers confine themselves to establishing the authority of the Pope, and omit to state that the Episcopate also is essential to the Church's very existence and succeeds to the Apostles as a body, "college succeeding to college." The very moderate price of the book is due to the action of a friend and admirer of the lecturer who has generously defrayed the entire cost of publication "so that they might issue at a very reduced price and might reach a wider circle of readers." No money could have been more wisely and, we hope, more fruitfully spent.

A. B.

IN her *Apotheosis and After Life* (London: Constable and Co. 1915. 8s. 6d. net) Mrs. Arthur Strong has produced a very interesting book, well written, exhaustively documented and illustrated by excellent and well-chosen illustrations, nor can we refrain from congratulating the publishers on the very handsome manner in which the work is produced. The introduction is a defence of Imperial Rome as against those who have of late endeavoured to belittle it as a serious factor in the history of art, alleging that anything good in it came from the East and was not improved by its journey. Mrs. Strong admits the influence of the East, but not the other part of the thesis, and further urges that the Romans touched a higher spiritual level than the Greeks, with all their technical skill, and that the heights of inspiration which they reached helped to pave the way for the triumphal progress of Christianity.

The second part of the book, dealing with the Apotheosis is a further development of this argument by a concrete case, and the general line may perhaps best be indicated by a brief paraphrase. The Greeks never had a real central deity, for it might almost be said of Zeus

Some Recent Books

amongst the Olympians that he was *primus inter pares*, and though monotheism was the central doctrine of the Orphic sects, for example, and of more than one system of philosophy, and may possibly have been realised by Pheidias in the Olympian Zeus, of the original of which we are ignorant, still the religious system never rose to anything really approaching monotheism. In fact, when the Pantheon came to Rome it very nearly swamped the essential monotheism of the Roman mind. Indeed, it might have swamped it had not the idea of the Divvs Avgvstvs, the god-emperor, with its centralising effect, prevented this from occurring. In fact, this central idea overrode even that of Jupiter, who is represented in art as handing over his insignia to the god-emperor. The same thing is shown by their art. The pediments of Greek temples are not so much real pedimental designs as bits out of a frieze, whereas the Roman pediments tend towards a central figure, frontally placed and more or less regardless of the action at either side of him. They thus form a *maiestas*, and lead up to the well-known Christian *maiestas* so familiar to us in the tympana of Gothic edifices. The centralising idea of the Apotheosis, first applied in the case of Julius Cæsar, it is argued, paved the way for the reception of the centralised form of Christianity, whilst the idea of the emperor-god rendered the acceptance of the doctrine of the Incarnation less difficult. Further, in ecclesiastical art the figure of Christ takes the place of the god-emperor, though the art-type of the former is not derived from the latter. But the idea of the *maiestas*, the centralised and frontal position and attitude, is.

The final part of the book is occupied with the question of the belief in immortality, which, as Mrs. Strong rightly says, is a view of things held *semper et ubique* if not *ab omnibus*. We cannot enter at length into the treatment of this most important and fascinating question, though on certain points we find it not easy fully to agree with her, or indeed with the dominant anthropological views of the day, influenced so much by the works of

Is Schism Lawful

Frazer, whose conclusions we do not think can always be followed with safety. But we think that she does make her point, which is that, whilst the Greeks of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. had largely, if not entirely, lost their belief in a future state, or, at any rate, posed as having done so, the Romans, "by holding spiritual ideals all but repudiated by classic Greece, contributed towards the emancipation of mankind from the haunting fear of death." A very interesting and a very suggestive book.

B. C. A. W.

THEOLOGICAL science in these countries has owed not a little to Maynooth and the Dunboyne Establishment, and the indebtedness seems likely to be increased as years go on. In Fr. Maguire's Thesis for the Doctorate, *Is Schism Lawful, A Study in Primitive Ecclesiology* (Dublin: Gill and Son. pp. xx., 323. 5s. net) we have a fresh example of the work that is being done there. Though the author depends to some extent upon the usual modern historians of dogma, Batiffol, Duchesne, and Tixeront, there are an independence of thought and a vigour of expression that leave no doubt in the mind as to the author's own power of original contribution. He is not afraid to write :—

If a doctrine in the course of its development—and is there not evidence of development everywhere ?—has had to encounter a certain amount of uncertainty, and even of positive opposition, is it therefore to be rejected as intrusive ? How many truths of faith now universally accepted succeeded in making their way into the Creed unchallenged ? How many have been held *semper, ubique et ab omnibus* ?

But the result of his close investigation of the New Testament and the Ante-Nicene writings, as against all forms of Protestantism, is that "To divide the Church—*whatever be the form of government*—is to divide the Body of Christ. Schism is never lawful." The criticism of specific theories of Protestant writers, though to the point, is brief. But more could hardly be expected in an

Some Recent Books

historical work which is mainly concerned with the Early Church.

Another work emanating from Maynooth is of much the same character, inasmuch as it also has been presented as a thesis for the Doctorate. Fr. O'Dwyer has taken for his subject *Confirmation, A Study in the Development of Sacramental Theology*. (Dublin: Gill and Son. pp. x., 191. 3s. 6d.) We deeply regret our inability to discuss the work to the extent that it deserves. The Sacrament of Confirmation was one of the first Sacraments to be attacked by the Protestant Reformers. It had already been widely discussed in the Mediæval Schools; whilst the bare teaching of the modern hand-books often fails to indicate the differences of opinion and explanation that have been, and are indeed still, found in the matter and form of the Sacrament. Fr. O'Dwyer is, on his own confession, no *a priori* theologian. His learning is his own and has resulted in the acceptance of the view, "almost against his wishes," that Christ left to His Church the power of making specific changes in essentials of the Sacrament. He believes that consignation has been substituted for the Apostolic imposition. This is not a view with which every theologian will agree. But the author's learned and skilful argument demands serious attention, and his conclusion will perhaps be more readily accepted, in spite of its difficulties, by historical students.

J. O'B.

THE *Personality of Christ*, by Abbot Vonier, of Buckfast Abbey (Longmans. pp. 275. 5s. net), is a book of a kind which is much needed and likely to do an exceedingly useful work. Its aim is to put the intricacies of some part of the theology of the Incarnation in such a way that it may be understood and enjoyed by those who have not received a strict theological training. In this attempt the Abbot seems to us to have been singularly successful. Many a reader will gather from these pages his first idea of what theology really means, and will be encouraged to go on to learn more of so wonderful

The Personality of Christ

a science. The book is particularly valuable because it aims throughout at drawing even the deepest mysteries of theology out of the familiar words of the Gospels and showing how all is there contained and involved. Sometimes the Abbot seems to us to be needlessly scholastic in his statement of doctrine, but this is not often the case, and the book as a whole is one of the most valuable works in the domain of popular theology that have appeared for some time. We hope that it may be followed by many others of a like nature.

WE are ordinarily unable to devote space to the notice of small devotional books, but a rare exception must be made in the case of Miss Marie Ellerker's *Master, Where Dweldest Thou?* (Burns and Oates, pp. xvi., 103. 1s. 6d. net), since it is of rare and exceptional worth. It introduces the young reader, in the familiar language of devotion, to a whole new world of Christian archæology, of liturgical tradition, and of ecclesiological treasures old and new. The many illustrations, all of them showing the best things, such as the Syon Cope, St. Dominic's chasuble, and the Ardagh chalice, would alone mark the book out as an ideal gift. Authoress and publishers have joined hands to produce a book beautiful in every sense.

TO recommend a work that has reached its ninth edition would seem to be more than superfluous. This, the latest, edition of Fr. Wapelhorst's *Compendium Sacrae Liturgiae* (New York: Benziger Bros. pp. xiv., 616) will be naturally and deservedly received cordially by all who know the merits of the earlier editions. The principal change made is that full attention is given to the recent alterations in the Divine Office. This has been done mainly in the interest of seminarists, for whom indeed the manual has always been of special use. But apart from minute points open to discussion the work is one that may be recommended to every priest anxious to have at hand a full yet compendious guide to one aspect of his work.

Some Recent Books

IN his *Birth Time of the World and Other Scientific Essays* (Fisher Unwin, 10s. 6d.), Dr. Joly, the learned Professor of Geology in the University of Dublin, deals with a number of topics of great interest in a manner rendering them available for the ordinarily intelligent reader, and we need not say, having regard to his reputation, with scrupulous accuracy and modesty. For here we have no theories, still hanging in the balance, proclaimed as the infallible gospel of science, but due regard is paid to the doubtful nature of the conclusions based on the definite facts detailed.

Thus we have discourses on Mountain Genesis and the Structure of the Alps and on the cause of the exquisitely bright colours which are possessed by the flowers growing on those mountains. In the article "Other Minds than Ours?" there is a most fascinating account of the so-called "Canals" on the planet Mars, with a discussion as to their causation, which puts forward a possible explanation which would relieve us of the necessity for believing them the work of the hands of men, or creatures in the same category perhaps as men, as some have claimed them to be. "The Latent Image" deals with the vexed question as to the physics of photography, and an essay on Skating teaches us that progress on ice is possible, while progress on the far smoother surface of plate-glass is not, and that this is due to the fact that we do not really skate on ice at all, but on a thin film of water produced by the compression of the skate weighted by the skater, which film immediately re-freezes when the weight is taken off.

To the title-essay we must direct rather more attention, for on this point—and not on this alone—Professor Joly is a recognized authority all the world over. How can we estimate the age of the world, from the time that it came to be worthy of that name, and what is that age? It will interest readers to be aware that there are several lines of investigation leading to an answer to the latter question. First of all there is that of the saltiness of the sea. That it *is* salt everybody knows, but few

Violations of the Laws of War

reflect upon the fact that when the waters first formed upon the surface of the earth from condensation of the dense mists by which our planet was surrounded, they fell as pure distilled water. Hence all the salts in the sea must have been acquired since, and acquired from the sediments washed down by rivers, which sediments come from the wear and tear of the rocks and soils over which the rivers pass. If we know, as we do, the amount of sediments brought down by great rivers or by some great rivers, such as the Mississippi, and the percentage of common salt therein contained, and the salinity of the ocean, we can make a calculation as to the time necessary for the production of that salinity. How great it is is shown by the statement that if all the salt in the sea were converted into rock-salt and spread over the entire surface of the dry land it would cover it to a depth of 354 feet.

Then, again, there are the results obtained by the consideration of the degradation-processes of radium results based on recent work, and at present of a highly tentative character. Finally there are the very remarkable Pleochroic Haloes found in certain minerals—mica for example—to which a separate article is devoted. Some of these haloes in County Carlow mica have been estimated to have required from 20 to 400 million years for their formation, yet the rock in which they are found is not by any means one of the oldest known. The attention of philosophical students may be very specially directed to the last essay in the book, entitled "A Speculation as to a Pre-Material Universe," which is worthy of careful reading but which space does not permit us to do more than indicate here. The book, which is illustrated by exceedingly beautiful photographs, is well worth a place on the shelves of any library, public or private.

B. C. A. W.

IN the multitude of publications about the war it is possible for us to notice in our limited space only a few of the more notable volumes of various types, of

Some Recent Books

which undoubtedly the first must be an important addition to the material officially made available—Mr. J. O. P. Bland's edition in English of the Report on *Germany's Violations of the Laws of War* (Heinemann. pp. 344. 5s. net), compiled under the auspices of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This volume is an indispensable supplement to the Report and published evidence of Lord Bryce's Committee, and has the additional advantage of comprising introductory chapters giving us the documents for the violation of the neutrality of Luxembourg and Belgium, and for the violation of the French frontier before declaration of war. We need enlarge neither upon the horrible nature of the disclosures, nor upon the conclusive character of the evidence, consisting, as this does so largely, of the letters and diaries—many of them reproduced in facsimile—of the German soldiery themselves. Those who desire a handy *précis* of the Report will find it in a volume of the admirable *Pages Actuelles*, edited by Mgr Baudrillart and noticed in our last issue—*L'Armée du Crime*, by "Vindex." (Paris: Bloud & Gay. 60 centimes.) A further useful *précis*, with a large number of the documents very clearly reproduced in facsimile, is given in *German Atrocities from German Evidence* (Paris: Colin. 50 centimes), by Professor Bédier, translated by Mr. Bernard Harrison, in the "Studies and Documents on the War," issued by M. Lavissee's Committee. Several useful additions have been made, since our last issue, to both series, which we heartily commend, in their respective spheres, to the attention of our readers.

OF recent contributions by unofficial writers to the problems of the war, one of great weight is Dr. Marion Newbigin's *Geographical Aspects of Balkan Problems* (Constable & Co. pp. 238. 7s. 6d. net.) This is a work of erudition of the very best type, based on a thorough study both of the facts and of the authorities—Slav, German and Austrian—who have investigated them, thoroughly documented, and illustrated with maps, of

Balkan Problems

which a large orographical one of the whole region is particularly fine. With the recent development of Balkan problems, Miss Newbigin's book has become, at least to the present writer, simply indispensable. It has been a fascinating study to trace in her company the effect of the geological and geographical development of the region upon its political history, the strong influences similarly exerted by the geographical history of the Adriatic and Ægean Seas, and of the Eastern European mountain-systems. And, as for the problem as it stands to-day, at every point—the incompatibilities of the small local nationalities, even the forms their religious problems assume, the *Drang nach Osten* of the Germanic Powers, the interests of the Slavs and of Italy, the gradual rolling back of the tide from the East—one sees physical fact, interpreted by the scientist, intervening with the decisive word, and pointing the warning finger with a significance that cannot be misunderstood. There are points, however, on which we feel we must reserve judgment. No true axiom has more often been made to serve the purposes of error than *cuique in suâ arte credendum*. We accept the science of the scientist, the special knowledge of the specialist, but when it comes to drawing conclusions for the infinite complexities of living, those of the scientist and specialist will not necessarily be true. Miss Newbigin has in this respect an admirably broad mind and a sense for reality. None the less, we wonder if she is not somewhat over-impressed by geography in her views on such a question as the degree to which Slav claims on the Adriatic coast can be met. There are other elements in the case, and it is interesting to compare the estimate given here by an authoritative geographer with that of Dr. Seton-Watson, an equal authority, who approaches the questions at issue from the point of view of the student of politics. A very convenient summary of his arguments and conclusions has lately been issued—*The Balkans, Italy, and the Adriatic* (Nisbet & Co. 1s.)—which, with all the force and brilliance of his larger works, drives home their

Some Recent Books

message in a few trenchant pages, besides adding several interesting points of recent development. The obligations of the public to Dr. Seton-Watson are sufficiently well known; those we are under to Miss Newbigin's work are scarcely less, and are enhanced by her admirably lucid exposition and her vivid and interesting treatment of matter which has great possibilities in the way of obscurity and dullness alike.

MR. EDWARD HUTTON is a literary artist, and his *Attila and the Huns* (Constable and Co. pp. xvi, 228. 6s. net) is accordingly good to read. As a work of mere erudition such a book might have been dull, as a piece of contemporary polemic, based on the "blazing indiscretion" of a modern monarch, it might have been shallow. It is neither, but is, in addition to being good history, political and military, and first-rate literature, an admirable contribution to the philosophy of history. Mr. Hutton has the root of the matter in him; he sees the same cause at stake on the plains of Champagne in the fifth and in the twentieth centuries—the cause of Christendom and of Christian civilization as handed down to modern Europe from ancient and Christian Rome. With regard to the origins and racial affinities of the present barbaric hordes—or rather of the Prussian horde that is driving the German peoples along the paths of barbarism—we are glad to see that Mr. Hutton in no way acquiesces in the common view that the Teutonic knights effectively annihilated the races of Prussia. On the contrary, there was an impregnation of the conquerors by the conquered, of such a kind as to leave indelible marks, only too plainly apparent to-day. Mr. Hutton has devoted a third of his book to reprinting in full his principal sources—Ammianus Marcellinus, etc.,—a new departure in book-making which we cannot commend; scholars will know where to find them, others will not need them. Also, it is almost scandalous that a book of this kind, full of political, military and topographical detail, should not be indexed.

Impressions in Belgium

LIKE Mr. Hutton, Mr. Ford Madox Hueffer, in his *Between Saint Dennis and Saint George* (Hodder & Stoughton. pp. xii, 298. 2s. 6d.) has much to say on the philosophy of race and of history, though here the form of the book—if we should not rather speak of its formlessness—is that of a series of vivid personal impressions of the characteristics of the three chief peoples at war, French, English and German. Mr. Hueffer's intimate acquaintance with all three peoples, and his long apprenticeship to the craft of letters, combine to make the work one of arresting interest. Necessarily there is a charm in Mr. Hueffer's consideration of "how we may best repay some of the debts humanity owes" to the land of chivalry, which is absent from his diagnosis of "Kultur," though the author's extensive acquaintance with the learned world of Germany gives his words on this subject greater weight than many others that have been written. The estimate of England, brilliant though it be, is to our mind spoiled by being inextricably mingled with a detailed polemic against a few people who have sought to advertise themselves by placing their pens at the service of their country's enemies. It was not worth while to spoil the literary form of a brilliant book in order to chastise a few unteachable and unimportant persons.

WE descend still further from the general to the particular with Miss May Sinclair's *A Journal of Impressions in Belgium* (Hutchinson & Co. pp. xii, 332, iv. 6s. net). While Mr. Hueffer always paints with a broad touch, Miss Sinclair is a novelist of the following of Mr. Henry James, and their respective war-books are what we should in consequence expect. If Miss Sinclair's *Journal* tells us little of what happened in Belgium, it tells us much that is quite as interesting and quite as important. What does a catastrophe like the present mean to the soul of the man—and of the woman—who is in the midst of it, and still more to the man who has voluntarily gone into the midst of it? We who are condemned to stay at home may gather more from the

Some Recent Books

small-talk of an ambulance party, and from the little details of its daily fortune, set down by an observer of trained perception and practised pen, than from any amount of theorising; also we may get nearer the soul of the War. The light Miss Sinclair gives us in these respects, the glimpses we get behind the curtain, make her *Journal* the fascinating and illuminating thing that it is.

AMONG war books must also be reckoned the new edition of Dr Holland Rose's *The Development of the European Nations 1870-1914* (Constable & Co. pp. xx, 649. 7s. 6d. net), the period during which, beginning with the violence done to Alsace-Lorraine, the present cataclysm was in more or less constant preparation. We need not enlarge on Dr Rose's success in the difficult art of writing contemporary history, nor on the merits of his book as perhaps the ablest, and certainly the best documented, summary of its period available. The new chapters on the war crisis and the years immediately preceding it are particularly good. Dr Rose's standpoint is not ours, and betrays an unconscious bias in regard to the Church. But every Catholic intelligent enough to read a book like this through, is intelligent enough to discount this element. H. S. D.

“WAR,” says Mr Stephen Graham, in his preface to Vladimir Soloviev's *War and Christianity* (Constable & Co. 4s. 6d. net) “has not prompted so many misgivings in Christian Russia as it has done in the humanitarian and materialistic West. It is felt that ‘Religion’”—here he quotes from Soloviev

is never shaken down by War, but logicians are shaken in their logic, agnosticism is shaken, materialism is shaken, atheism is shaken, positivism is shaken. The intellectual dominance is shaken and the spiritual powers are allowed to take possession of men's being.

Vladimir Soloviev must not be confounded with the famous Russian historian of that name. The writer of this volume of dialogues, newly and ably translated into English, was a philosopher of an intensely Russian and

War and Christianity

Christian cast of intellect. His writings are almost unknown in the West for the simple reason that, with a mass of other Russian literature, they have not been translated. "In his works," says Stephen Graham, "you may seek and find the Russian idea, the Eastern Christian point of view." But Mr Graham does not go on to speak of what to us is the most interesting element in Soloviev's thought, the fact that to this intellect, so deeply imbued with the Christian idea, the Catholic Church under Papal Government is the only human expression of the Kingdom of Christ. It has remained a mystery whether Soloviev was or was not received into the Church when on his death-bed. It is improbable, as his attitude as a Russian Orthodox was much that of the High Anglican who is convinced that, remaining in the Church of England, he can serve her better by educating his generation in Catholic thought and practice than by personal submission. But Soloviev's writings are permeated with the Re-union of Christendom, not through any compromise, but by full submission of the Russian Church to Rome. The Russian peasant, he maintains, has in no wise to change his faith or practice; the submission would be to him merely a change of Church Government, the point of difference over the Persons of the Trinity, which constitute the schism of the Eastern Church, having very little weight in the lay Russian mind, so much more mystical than dogmatic in character.

We find this idea set forth in the present volume, in a long and rather fantastic tale of Antichrist, told by one of the five Russians who in three dialogues discuss the vexed question of War and Christianity. The form and setting of the argument is delightfully Russian in character. One is constantly reminded of those fascinating and inconclusive discussions on verandahs at midnight hours in Dostoevsky's novels. They are a whimsical mixture of theories, satire, profound observation and racy narrative. They are totally lacking in anything like heavy dogmatism—a refreshing quality indeed.

C. B.

Some Recent Books

THE two new volumes issued by the Henry Bradshaw Society are both of more than usual interest and importance. Dr. Wickham Legg has edited, under the title of *Cranmer's Liturgical Projects*, the two MSS. in the British Museum which, bound in a single volume, are known as Royal 7, B. IV. This book was first brought to notice by Cardinal Gasquet and Mr. Edmund Bishop in their book on *Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer*, and a large portion of the text was printed by them. It is of great importance to the professed student of the Book of Common Prayer, but as it deals entirely with the proposed changes in the Breviary and has little to do with the doctrinal questions which were then being discussed its interest is not so great for the general reader. The other is Mr. H. A. Wilson's new edition of *The Gregorian Sacramentary under Charles the Great*, a careful collation of the three most important MSS. in existence, which are all of the ninth century; Mr. Wilson having added to the two employed by Muratori, *Reginæ* 337 and *Ottobonianus* 313, both of which came to the Vatican Library from the collections of Queen Christina of Sweden, a third authority in Codex 164 of Cambrai. The editing has been admirably done; for that Mr. Wilson's name is sufficient guarantee, and it will be a great boon for all students of liturgiology to have in their hands an edition of the *Gregorianum* so compact, trustworthy and easily accessible. Our debt to the Henry Bradshaw Society for the admirable work it is doing in these fields is very great.

THE WRITINGS ON THE WALLS by Conall Cearnach (Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, 1s.) is a pleasantly written and, at the same time, erudite series of essays, largely, though not entirely, on linguistic topics. That which gives its name to the book deals, for example, with the *graffiti* on the walls of Pompeii. The last two essays, which deal with various points in connection with the Irish language, so little known—perhaps one might even say, so lightly considered—in England, may be

The Children's Encyclopædia

commended to the careful study of those who desire to know something about the genius of a language which philologically and grammatically—to say nothing of its literature—yields in interest to no other tongue in the world. Having thus whetted their appetites, they may turn to Mr Rhys Phillips' work *The Celtic Countries, Their Literary and Library Activities* (published by the Author, Chaddesley Terrace, Swansea, 1s. 3d.) for an account of the various movements of late years for the preservation of what seemed—perhaps one should even say seem—to be the disappearing Celtic forms of speech. It comes with rather a shock when we see the name of Patagonia included on the title-page amongst the Celtic countries, but it appears that there is a large Welsh settlement maintaining its own tongue in that far-off part of the world.

B. C. A. W.

THE eight attractive and yet solid volumes of *The Children's Encyclopædia* (The Educational Book Co., Ltd., 17 New Bridge Street, London, E.C.) which lie before us for review recall an incident which, now that it is happily closed, is seen to have its diverting side. When some years ago the work in which the present publication originated began to be issued in monthly parts, and Catholics were invited to purchase it, they hardly knew whether to be more astonished at the *naïveté* which could imagine that certain pages would be acceptable to them, or at the hardihood which could issue them at all. The matter was promptly taken up, and the reasonable objections raised were as promptly and as reasonably met. The result has been on the one side a useful demonstration of the force of Catholic opinion, which might well be copied in affairs of wider import, and on the other a valuable asset, in the form of a testimonial from the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, almost amounting to an *imprimatur*. Thus may the wise "turn their necessity to glorious gain." One cannot help wishing that politicians were as competent business men as are publishers. But this little incident of public

Some Recent Books

interest is by no means the only reason why we are glad to devote a page of this REVIEW to a juvenile book. For *The Children's Encyclopædia* is of notable importance for all engaged in the training of the young, and is in itself of no small interest for the adult mind. Fully alive to the advances of the last ten years, we have no hesitation in describing it as the most important contribution to educational method on the new lines that that period has seen. The skill with which the compilers have combined solidity with clearness, and yet avoided any sort of childishness, particularly in the articles dealing with science, pure and applied, is really amazing, and the illustrations are almost uncanny in their ingenuity. Literary and historical interests are adequately represented, and amusements as well; and, as we have indicated, the work is both in tone and in substance acceptable to Catholic taste. No school library can afford to be without this Encyclopædia. We say library rather than bookshelf advisedly, for it is a book that boys and girls will read spontaneously and for recreation, and not a sort of simplified Encyclopædia of the reference type. Were it that, it would to our mind have no value. Any intelligent boy of thirteen is quite capable of using an ordinary Encyclopædia for reference in essay-writing, history and the like, and the true educational wisdom in this matter is to set him to something which will develop his powers rather than descend to his limitations. But for all the valuable development of mind which comes from spontaneous reading there must be attractiveness, and the triumph of the compilers of this work is that they have produced something as full of solid instruction as an egg is full of nourishment, which nevertheless is as vociferously demanded from the school librarian as a story by Jules Verne.

Readers Please Note.

IN CONSEQUENCE OF THE WAR
THE ATHENÆUM

For nearly a Century the
Leading Literary Weekly Journal

HAS BEEN CONSIDERABLY ENLARGED

AND

IS NOW PUBLISHED AS A
MONTHLY REVIEW

Price 1/- net. By Post 1/2

Annual Subscription 14/- Post Free to all parts of the world.

No revolutionary changes in the general format or appearance of THE ATHENÆUM have been made, although the monthly issue naturally contains more matter than the weekly. Original short stories and articles on matters of literary and general interest are from time to time included. Adequate space, however, is still devoted to reviews of important books under all headings, as well as to notices of Plays, Concerts, Fine Art Exhibitions, and Scientific Meetings. Our monthly List of New Books also comprises a series of short critical reviews.

THE ATHENÆUM IS READY ON
THE 15TH OF EACH MONTH

Order early through your Newsvendor, or direct from
THE ATHENÆUM OFFICE, 11, BREAMS BUILDINGS,
CHANCERY LANE, LONDON, E.C.



SPAIN AND THE WAR

A ROUGH Channel crossing in rainy weather was not a good beginning for a holiday, but how could we expect comfort in travel during this war? The sight of English soldiers in French territory, the darkness of the streets of Paris, the deep mourning of many persons in France, the continual demand for our passports, reminded my two companions and myself, if we needed reminding, that we were engaged in war. Still, the journey was not so difficult as we anticipated, thanks to a letter which the French Ambassador in London had most kindly given us; and Mgr. Ottley, Fr. Lawton and myself found ourselves across the Bidasoa, which divides Spain from France, within 25 hours of leaving Folkestone.

Spain is more than twice the size of Great Britain, and railway travelling is not so easy as in this country. There was not time in the five weeks at my disposal to visit the whole country, and we therefore contented ourselves with the "circular ticket," which enabled us to go to San Sebastian, Valladolid, Madrid, Saragossa and Barcelona, entering Spain by the western side of the Pyrenees and leaving it by the coast of the Mediterranean. It was convenient to go to other places from these as centres. Thus from San Sebastian we motored to the famous house of the Jesuits at Loyola, where the Rector gave us a most hearty welcome, and seemed genuinely disappointed that we did not accept his hospitality for the night in order to say Mass at the birthplace of St. Ignatius on the morrow. The narrow-gauge railway, unusual in Spain, took us from San Sebastian to Bilbao, the capital of the Basque province of Biscay and a very busy and important town, but through the kindness of a friend we made the return journey of 100 miles by motor, passing through magnificent scenery. We did not realize our hopes of going from Valladolid to Salamanca, because we were informed that the professors and students of the Irish College of Salamanca were spending their summer holidays in Galicia; so we prolonged our stay at the English

Spain and the War

College of Valladolid, which Father Parsons founded in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. From Madrid, our next stopping-place, we went for a day to the great Royal Monastery of the Escorial, built by Philip II after the battle of St. Quentin, and it was also from the Capital that we arranged to visit the Cardinal Primate in his cathedral city of Toledo.

My object in going to Spain last September was not, however, to take a holiday, but to combine pleasure with work for England, utilising my familiarity with the Spanish language and habits of thought in order to find out the attitude of our fellow Catholics towards the Allies. Their pro-German sympathies had so often been asserted in my hearing that I considered it worth while to ascertain the truth for myself, and, if possible, to let them know our side of the dispute. In a war such as this is we cannot afford to affect indifference to hostile opinion where such exists, and it is no small achievement to increase the number of our well-wishers or even to correct the misunderstandings of those we cannot altogether win. My own experiences were completely different from those of the Abbé Lugan, recorded in the *Tablet* last November, and nothing could have surpassed the kindness and courtesy with which I was everywhere received; while as a Catholic Bishop with a knowledge of Spanish I had unique opportunities of meeting many distinguished ecclesiastics, whose views could not fail to be worthy of consideration.

In San Sebastian, the fashionable seaside place at which the Court was staying in September, I met the Papal Nuncio, Monsignor Ragonesi, who, during the three years in which he has represented the Holy See in Spain, has won golden opinions by his sympathetic understanding of the Spanish nation. At Toledo, the primatial city, once so mighty and always so interesting, Cardinal Guisasola received us. Many will remember the gracious presence of Cardinal Sancha at our Eucharistic Congress in London, and will be surprised to learn that Cardinal Guisasola is not his immediate successor.

Spain and the War

Two Spanish Primates have died since 1908. As a rule a Bishop has been in several Dioceses before he is made Primate, and the last one went to Toledo at the age of 74. The present Archbishop of Toledo and Patriarch of the West Indies is 63 years old. He is full of energy and exercises great influence over the whole of Spain. After luncheon at his Palace I was privileged to have a long conversation with his Eminence. I had already spoken to another Spanish Cardinal, the Archbishop of Valladolid, a true friend to the English and Scotch Colleges in that city where Columbus breathed his last and where Philip II first saw the light. Spain has nine Archbishops, but time did not allow me to call on any other Archbishop besides those just mentioned and the Archbishop of Saragossa. Saragossa owes its religious importance chiefly to the shrine of our Lady del Pilar, the most renowned in the whole peninsula. The Archbishop there was deeply interested in what I related to him about England, and I did not omit to point out to his Grace, as to others when occasion arose, the harm which may easily be done by Spanish Catholics writing or speaking publicly against England or France. It was out of the question to go to all the Bishops of Spain, as there are more than 40, but I saw three of their number. The Bishop of Madrid was most friendly on the two occasions on which we conversed on England. He has a diocese of the first importance, though established only 30 years ago, and the three Cardinals whom I have mentioned were all at some time Bishops of Madrid. While in the capital it was also my good fortune to meet the Bishop of Sion. He has no diocese, but his jurisdiction extends over the Army and Navy, and he is the Dean of the Court Chaplains and Ordinary of all the Institutes under Royal patronage. He is now ageing very much, but in speaking with me he manifested a great deal of the vigour for which he was known in his prime. The information which I obtained from a much younger Bishop, commonly called the Bishop of Ciudad Real but in fact Prior of the Four Military Orders of Spain, proved very useful

Spain and the War

on several occasions. Among the priests, too, there was much to be done. It would be hard to say what is the number of secular priests in Spain, but it is certainly very large. They have two influential organisations at least. The "Liga de la defensa del clero," with its headquarters in Madrid, comprises some 14,000 members in different parts of the country, and at Barcelona we found a more local association of 600 priests, whose object is the apostolate among the people. It was a very great pleasure to make the acquaintance of the able directors of these two important works.

The Religious Orders of the Church are always powerful, and in Catholic Spain this is specially the case. They suffered terrible persecution in the first half of the last century, but freedom was restored to them under Alfonso XII, and now they are once more in power, notwithstanding certain critical periods while Canalejas was Premier. The Society of Jesus has houses in every place in which we stayed, and I made a point of visiting them all; at Bilbao and Saragossa we enjoyed the hospitality of the Fathers. There are three provinces of the Society in Spain, and I spoke to two of the Provincials. They were pleased to know that we had many Jesuits in the diocese of Southwark and that England had generously given a home to their brethren from France and from Belgium. Through the *Messenger of the Sacred Heart*, through *Razon y Fé* and through *Lectura Dominical*, the Fathers are able to exercise an influence which is perhaps even more extensive than that of their colleges and churches. It was, however, very wonderful to see what a centre of religious activity the church of the Jesuits had become at Bilbao, and I was very pleased to address more than 500 men of their Sodality at Barcelona. I also saw the two Provincials of the Augustinians: one at Valladolid and the other in Madrid. The Augustinians from their Monastery of the Escorial publish a review called *Ciudad de Dios*, and in Madrid they have *España y America*. Both of these reviews have, unfortunately, printed articles against us,

Spain and the War

and it is important to make them more friendly. I called on Franciscans and Dominicans also whenever I was able, and I explained to them my desire of preventing any attacks from Catholics in Spain which might afterwards prove detrimental to religion amongst us. The Escolapios, founded by St. Joseph Calasanctius and devoting themselves to education, have more than 5,000 boys under their care in Barcelona alone. Speaking to one of their Assistant Generals, he reminded me of the words of the late Lord Salisbury, at the Guildhall Banquet, showing that the allusion to the dying nations, made many years ago by an English Prime Minister, had deeply hurt Spanish sentiment. I wish it had been possible to make the favourite pilgrimage from Barcelona to our Lady of Montserrat, especially as this is the only important monastery at present of the Spanish sons of St. Benedict in the Peninsula.

It would not have been wise to neglect the convents, as the nuns, too, and particularly the teaching Orders, have large circles of friends in that Catholic land. The Communities of the Sacred Heart welcomed us as their guests at San Sebastian and Barcelona, and in Madrid we stayed in the Assumption Convent. We called wherever we found convents of these two Orders, and I was able to address the community on the spread of the Catholic Church in England and on the liberty given to persecuted religious to find a home in our midst. They were surprised to hear that we could have processions of Our Lady in the streets of London. Visits to the Convents of Marie Reparatrice and of the Esclavas formed part of my programme, and the religious were always most interested. When any asked about Belgium I told them how Monsignor Dewachter, who has lived with me since the fall of Antwerp, had related to me atrocities committed by Germans in Belgium. But, having been warned, by persons in Spain who were in a position to know, that it was better not to insist too greatly on the crimes of Germany as I should only irritate without convincing my audience, I followed the

Spain and the War

good advice and confined myself to an account of what was being done for the Catholic Church here, and pointing out the danger of any public attack on our Government by the Catholics of Spain, just answering briefly any questions in regard to our enemies.

Though my work was thus chiefly in ecclesiastical circles it was not exclusively so. My aim was to collect as perfect ideas as possible of the nation's opinion, and to this end my companions and myself listened most willingly to the views of many lay persons as well.

It would have been thought strange if I had not asked for an audience with His Catholic Majesty when, as a Catholic Bishop, I was staying at San Sebastian, and, through the kindness of Sir Arthur Hardinge, our Ambassador, we had the honour of being received at the Miramar Palace on September 15th at noon. Monsignor Ottley and Father Lawton accompanied me, but His Majesty was graciously pleased to speak to me for 45 minutes before he allowed me to present to him my two companions. I was certainly charmed with the Spanish Monarch, and he impressed me as one who thoroughly knows and loves his people and understands the European situation to perfection. As the audience had lasted much longer than was expected we were commanded to return the following day to pay our respects to the Queen. We were thus privileged to have an audience with the Queen, who was naturally most interested in hearing news about England, and we were afterwards received by the Queen Mother, whose long regency gained her the admiration and the esteem of the whole world, and who, though herself an Austrian Archduchess, spoke most kindly of the good relations up to now between England and the land of her birth.

Among the laity we found many who were invaluable to us but whose names it is better not to give in this article. We saw many prominent persons and especially several important writers. The journalists, of course, were only too anxious to interview us, to ascertain whether we had any special mission, but we thought it better to

Spain and the War

see only those who were recommended to us by the many excellent and prudent friends whom we met in the course of our visit. Thus we gathered all the information that we could, and all three of us were well pleased with what we saw and heard, although it was inevitable that we should come in contact with a certain number whose sympathies were definitely against us.

I have related all this in order to make it clear that our opinion on the situation in Spain is at least entitled to a hearing. We certainly came to the conclusion that the people of Spain, as a body, wish to keep out of the European conflict, and do not intend to be dragged into it. The country has had wars and civil difficulties as its portion for a century, and peace is absolutely necessary for the development of its many resources, while the ceaseless struggle round Melilla drains the nation quite sufficiently. It would be extremely hard to speak with accuracy as to the sympathy of Spain with one side or the other. You cannot have the issue put clearly and plainly, and the political conditions are very complicated. The history of Spain shows us how different kingdoms were gradually brought under one king, and Castile, Aragon and Navarre still preserve their characteristics, widely different from Andalusia. The Basque provinces are quite distinct from the rest of the kingdom, and the Carlists still have many adherents there. Barcelona, with its ever increasing commerce, is always resentful of the authority of Madrid. There are to be found persons who would do or say anything to embarrass the dynasty, though the King is deservedly very popular with the greater part of his subjects. Speaking generally, however, the military admire German methods of training: the clergy resent the French treatment of the Church, and religiously-minded persons fear that the Allies may be hostile to the Catholic religion: while, on the other hand, many believe that we grossly exaggerate the atrocities in Belgium and they still have a very high opinion of the Germans because they do not know them. France and England are near but Germany is too far off.

Spain and the War

In my letter to *The Times* of November 20 last, I stated that there seemed to be a prejudice against England arising from several reasons. Prominent among these is the possession of Gibraltar by the British, a grievance with which the Carlist orator, Sr. Vasquez Mella, made great play last May at a meeting in Madrid. It is not forgotten, moreover, that in the Cuban War of 1898, Great Britain, as reflected at any rate by the Press, sided with the United States, and thus contributed to the loss of the Spanish colonies. Worst of all, many Spaniards, with all their reason for justifiable pride on account of the nation's splendid history, imagine that they are looked upon by England with contempt. Even the want of strenuous propaganda for our side at the beginning of the present war was interpreted as meaning that we do not care in the least whether they are with us or against us, and all the time Germany is extremely busy procuring the good will of Spain.

I was told, however, that nothing would be said to me against England, but I was warned not to flatter myself that this was a sign of benevolence towards us. It would simply be to avoid giving me personal offence. In speaking to me very often the grievances against France would be mentioned, and our alliance was given as the cause for any unfriendly attitude. A hundred years have passed since the Peninsular War, but the memory of the French invasion still survives, and some who blamed Belgium for resisting the German army are nevertheless proud of the defence of Saragossa. Fresh cause of resentment is the French protectorate of Morocco, which Spain has wanted since her war with the Moors in 1859. They say that, though Tangier is international, most of the inhabitants there speak Spanish, and the Spanish schools educate some 1,500 children without distinction of creed, and that, if France and England were friendly, it could be easily given over to Spain. Another great obstacle to a favourable view of our case among the fervent Catholics of the country, and these are many, is the legislation against the Church in France. This appeared to have a

Spain and the War

great effect, as the Spaniards have seen crowds of exiled religious taking refuge in their country, and they have an ever present fear that the example of France may be followed by their own Government, and that their own religious men and women may be turned adrift to find an exile's home as best they can. Lovers of the Holy See, they have read with sorrow that the Concordat was broken and the relations between the Vatican and the eldest daughter of the Church ended.

On the other hand, in Spain the Kaiser is reported to be well disposed to Catholics, and some, strange to say, imagine that he will restore the Temporal Power to the Pope. The Kaiser may have promised this, as well as the restoration of Gibraltar, knowing that he will never be able to carry out his promise. His utterances are thought to be sincere, though we know that deeds do not very often correspond with words. Again, Spaniards have a very high opinion of German Catholics, but they do not realise that there are no Jesuit Colleges or Sacred Heart Convents in Prussia, and that Germany opposed the Holy See when the Encyclical on St. Charles Borromeo was issued by Pius X, when the same Pope required the oath against Modernism to be taken by priests, and also when the *Ne Temere* Decree on marriage and that on the early Communion of children were published. Spaniards who admire Germany do not know her, but their admiration must not surprise us as many amongst us, too, had great esteem for the Germans till they violated the neutrality of Belgium; and since then the destruction at Aerschot, Termonde, Louvain and many other places; the sinking without reason or warning of the *Lusitania*, the *Arabic*, the *Persia* and countless others; the bombardment of unfortified towns like Scarborough and the numerous Zeppelin raids on defenceless places have made us think that the culture of twentieth-century Germans is not unlike the barbarity of fifth-century Huns. These facts have either not been brought before the notice of Spain or have been strongly denied by the numberless German agents in that country.

Spain and the War

The Germans have made a good use of the Spanish Press to hide or explain what tells against them and to misrepresent the Allies.

We cannot but deplore that some excellent Catholics should be in favour of our enemies in this war. The vast majority of the people of Spain are on our side, but we feel deeply the tendency of the clergy and religious to be hostile to us. We wish to win them and to make them see the justice of our cause. It is worth while making every effort to show them for what principles we are fighting, and that we were not prepared for the war because we did not want it, whereas Germany had been ready and forced the war upon us by her invasion of Belgium. I am sure that any mark of good will shown by us will be gratefully appreciated by the Spaniards. Only a short time back I learnt that the leading article in *The Times* in connection with my letter on Spain had rejoiced many persons in that country, and the praise of Spain's benevolent neutrality by Lord Robert Cecil in the House of Commons last November was also gladly noted and will be remembered. It would be well if the Press in this country, and public men, too, sometimes spoke in praise of Spain, and the more we have of this friendly feeling the better will it be. England cannot afford to lose the friendship of Spain, and Germany for that reason is doing all in her power to prejudice Spain against England. There are powerful motives for being grateful to Spain. Thus, in consequence of her friendly neutrality from the beginning of the war, France has been able to withdraw many troops from her frontier and to utilize them against the enemy. Besides, how many a mother has been able to obtain information about her missing son, or a wife about her husband, through the good offices of the King of Spain who spares no pains in order to find out the whereabouts of the prisoners in Germany? Our papers say little of this huge work, yet it entails a multitude of letters day by day for the benefit of the sufferers, as a special department has been opened in Spain by the King for that sole object. Spain has

Spain and the War

also been most patient with us over her great losses through the war. Her trade has suffered enormously, as what England is doing cannot fully compensate her for the trade formerly carried on with Germany, Austria, Belgium and Holland. It is not our fault, but we ought to make the sufferings of a friendly neutral as little as circumstances permit. I believe that the fruit trade alone stands to lose £2,000,000 a year, an enormous sum even for a very wealthy country. We shall be wise to help Spain in every way we can. The effect will be seen not merely during the present war, but more still afterwards when Germany will try and extend her power in Spain and capture all the trade. A very practical way of showing our friendship would be by working with our great Ally across the Channel for the thorough consideration of the question of Tangier in the light of what must necessarily become a reconstructed map of the world. Though the Spaniards wish to have Tangier, they perfectly understand that this cannot be arranged while we are all fighting. It is, of course, a matter which concerns France more than ourselves, but if we were fully convinced of its utility, our French friends would assuredly not decline to unite themselves with us in the undertaking. I am certain that if a definite promise were now made that both France and England will join with Spain in a comprehensive and unbiassed reconsideration of this international question when peace comes to be restored, an excellent effect would be produced in a country where we have many warm friends already, and where we earnestly hope to have many more still.

✠ PETER, BISHOP OF SOUTHWARK.

THE MEMORIA APOSTOLORUM *on the* APPIAN WAY

THE privileges which the Roman Law allowed to graves, even of criminals who had undergone capital punishment, made it easy for the Christians of the age of persecutions to keep in good order and with absolute impunity those of their relatives, friends, priests and bishops. We have on this point the evidence of the grave of St. Paul, which was not hidden in a crypt or a catacomb, but stood in the open air in an open field among a thousand other tombstones, which lined the road to Ostia, one of the most popular highways of the Campagna.

The same may be said for the sepulchre of St. Peter, which remained free and undisturbed on the border of the Via Cornelia until the age of the Emperor Elagabalus (218-222 A.D.) who, among other extravagances, started in the circus of the Vatican a race of chariots, each drawn by four elephants. And, as the ordinary track inside the hippodrome was obviously too narrow for such an experiment, a much larger one was made ready outside, by removing or destroying the tombs and mausoleums of the Via Cornelia which stood on the way.* This is the only true, historical, genuine evidence we have of a *possible* removal of the remains of St. Peter from the original crypt of the Via Cornelia; although how can we explain, such being the case, that the remains of the other bishops of Rome, inhumated close to Peter's coffin, were abandoned on the spot to be desecrated by Elagabalus and his elephants? And how can we explain the other fact that they were not disturbed in any way, as proved by the plan drawn in 1635 by Benedetto Drei, the master mason of Pope Paul V, in which even the grave of Linus, the second bishop of Rome ("buried side by side with the remains of the blessed Peter in the

* Compare *Vita Heliogab.* 23: "fertur . . . elephantorum quattuor quadrigas in Vaticano agitasse, dirutis sepulchris quae obsistebant."

The Memoria Apostolorum

Vatican, October 24, A.D. 78," as the *Liber Pontificalis* declares), was found absolutely intact in its original place?

Leaving then aside the dubious evidence of the *Vita Eliogab.*, all other information we possess on this controversy, collected by Monsignor Barnes in chapter five of his invaluable volume *St. Peter in Rome*, is more or less vague, obscure, uncertain, and contradictory. "It is not easy," Barnes says, "to put it together into a consistent story," with which sentence I most emphatically agree. At the same time there is no denying that near or at the place where the church of St. Sebastian now stands there was a *memoria* not of Peter alone, but of both "princes of the apostles," the nature of which has as yet to be ascertained. The solution of the problem has been taken up by the same Monsignor de Waal, who in 1893 had solved the problem of the so-called *Platonia*, proving it to have been, not a temporary resting-place of the apostles, but a mausoleum raised in honour of Quirinus, bishop and martyr of Siscia, in Pannonia Superior. Having obtained leave both from the State and the ecclesiastical authorities, Monsignor de Waal, aided by his disciples Styger and Fasiolo, began a thorough search under the nave of the present church, and although the excavations, inaugurated on March 16, were discontinued before the end of June, I must acknowledge that no recent archæological investigation within such narrow limits of time and space has been crowned with equally important results. It has been ascertained that no church, no monumental basilica existed on the site of the present San Sebastiano before the time of Pope Damasus (366-384): that when this pope erected the basilica its site was occupied by exquisite pagan columbaria of the first century, by a Roman villa with walls and crypts beautifully painted, and by a *pergula* or *trichlia* with a seat or bench running around at least two sides of the enclosing wall: and that this enclosing wall was painted in "garden style," if I may use such an expression, meaning that its frescoes represent a fence in trelliswork interlaced with flowery

The Memoria Apostolorum

creepers, on which rest graceful birds. It has been ascertained, moreover, that the grave of Sebastian, of the illustrious martyr whose name was given at a later age to the Basilica itself, and to the city gate leading to it, does not occupy any place of honour in Pope Damasus' scheme of the building, but only an obscure corner on the left aisle. Lastly, a rough stone coffin has been discovered in the centre of the church containing an embalmed body, wound with bands of linen, saturated in sweet-smelling essence, with a twig of evergreen laid across the chest. The body has been identified by means of a double title, engraved on a marble slab by a rough and illiterate hand as follows :—

S FAVIANUS (b)IC REQUI ESIT

“ Here lies Saint Fabianus,” the same who presided over the church, as bishop of Rome, from January 10, 236, to January 20, 250.

All these valuable finds are cast into a relative shade by that of a set of *graffiti* scratched on the walls of the *pergula* with the help of a nail or of the blade of a pocket knife, *graffiti* which have a direct connection with the main controversy at issue, namely, with the alleged temporary transferment of the bodies of Peter and Paul to the *catacumbæ* of the Appian Way. It would be impossible to describe and translate them one by one, especially as this difficult and heavy task has already been accomplished by Dr. Styger in his pamphlet *Scoperta di una memoria degli Apostoli Pietro e Paolo e del corpo di San Fabiano papa e martire* inserted in de Waal's *Römische Quartalschrift*, n. 2, 1915. There are hundreds of them nearly all pointing to the same fact that at this precise spot of the “Queen of roads” there was something which reminded the faithful and the pilgrims from beyond the seas or the Alps, of the presence, or life, or passion, or burial of Paul and Peter in Rome. But what was this *something*, this mysterious *Memoria Apostolorum*?

It must be clearly understood that the place on the

on the Appian Way

walls of which these legends were scratched is not the *Memoria Apostolorum* itself, but an open-air drinking garden, a *pergula*, a *trichlia*, adjoining the place of worship, where the pilgrims, fatigued by a three miles walk, could find refreshment. The Via Appia, the most popular cemetery in the suburbs of Rome, boasted of quite a large number of these *Osterie di Campagna* where funeral banquets and funeral potations could be ordered *à la carte* by relatives and friends of people buried in the neighbourhood. Curious and interesting information on this point can be gathered from pagan and Christian epitaphs. In the one marked n. 25,061, Vol. vi of the *Corpus Inscr. Latin.*, the deceased says to the passer-by: "Come on, bring with you a flask of wine, a glass, and whatever is needed for a libation." In another, numbered 19,007, the same invitation is worded: "Oh friends, drink now to my memory, and wish that the earth may be light upon me." We are told by St. Augustine that when his mother visited Milan in the year 384 the practice of eating and drinking to excess in honour of the martyrs had been stopped by St. Ambrose, although it was still flourishing in other regions, where crowds of pilgrims were still seen going from grave to grave drinking heavily at each station. A *graffito* scratched in a crypt of the catacombs of Priscilla on the Via Salaria says: "February 5 of the year 375, we Florentinus, Fortunatus and Felix came here *ad calicem*" (for the cup). The anniversary feast of St. Peter, June 29, was for our forefathers what is Christmas for us as regards joviality and luxury of banquets. The poorer classes of citizens were fed under the porch of the Vatican basilica. These gatherings, however, degenerated into such excesses of intoxication that St. Augustine felt bound to write to the Romans the well-known reproach:—

First you persecuted the martyrs with stones and other instruments of torture and death: and now you persecute their memory with your intoxicating cups.

The *osteria* adjoining the *Memoria Apostolorum* at

The Memoria Apostolorum

San Sebastiano must have had plenty of customers, judging from the number of signatures left on its walls. Here are a few specimens :—

Tomius Coelius took refreshment by Peter and Paul (*refrigerium feci*) ;

I, Parthenius and my companions took refreshment (*refrigeravi*) on the 19th of March;

Felicissimus and his companions took refreshments. . . .

Dalmatius has pledged himself to give refreshments ;

and so on. These and other customers belonged to the humbler classes of citizens, judging from their vulgar or servile names, such as Nativus, Dalmatius, Batimeos, Antonius, Gelasius, Parthenius, Felicissimus, Vincenius, Johannes, etc. It is not easy, however, to assign a date to the set of *graffiti*, because current handwriting does not show nor possess the chronological characteristics of epigraphic texts ; but judging from the style of masonry of the walls of the Caupona the legends must have been scratched somewhere between the end of the third and the middle of the fourth century, certainly after the era of persecution, when Christians could openly boast and leave evidence of their faith, even on the walls of a public-house.

The work of my life has lain rather with Pagan than with Christian archæology, and I do not pretend to enter into controversies which are beyond my own field of investigation ; but I hope I have a fair percentage of common sense, in the name of which the following facts or probable hypotheses can be accepted without hesitation.

First. There is no doubt that at (or very near) the spot where the church of San Sebastiano now stands there existed a *Memoria Apostolorum*, a hall or shrine connected with some act or event in the life of Peter and Paul. There were many such places in or near Rome : for instance, a room in the house of Pudens on the Viminal where the Gospel was first preached, another room in the house of Aquila and Prisca on the Aventine,

on the Appian Way

the walls of which have likewise echoed with the sound of Peter's voice, a crypt on the Via Salaria where baptism had been administered by the Apostle himself, and many others.

Second. Nothing is known of the origin, nature, or the *raison d'être* of the *Memoria* at San Sebastiano. It has been connected (as I have already stated) with a temporary removal of the remains of Peter from the original crypt on the Via Cornelia (threatened with destruction by the Emperor Elagabalus) to a hiding-place at the third milestone of the Appian Way. It is possible that this occurrence may have taken place: at all events, it is absolutely certain that the so-called *Platonia*, or underground semicircular hall, hitherto shown to pilgrims and venerated by pilgrims as the resting-place *pro tempore* of the Apostles Peter and Paul, has nothing to do with them either as a grave, or as a cenotaph, or as a *memoria* of any kind. The underground hall has been identified with the mausoleum of Quirinus of Siscia, bishop and martyr.

Third. This suggested translation of relics may be accepted as possible, if not probable, for Peter, for the reason given by the *Vita Heliogabali*; but it would be absurd for Paul, whose grave at the second milestone of the Via Ostiensis has never been disturbed or threatened by any sort of danger, before the Saracenic invasion of A.D. 846.

Fourth. Yet, in the great majority of the *graffiti* found in the Pergula, the invocation of the name of Paul precedes that of Peter:

Paule et Petre petite pro Victore—Paule Petre . . . rogate pro . . . —At Paulo et Petro refrigeravi—Paule et Petre petite pro Nativo—Paule et Petre in mente habete Sozomenum, etc., etc.

This partiality shown by visitors to the *Memoria Apostolorum* in the Appian Way for the name of Paul finds confirmation in other epigraphic records. In 1867

The Memoria Apostolorum

an inscription was discovered at Ostia, in a tomb of the Via Severiana, which says :

D(iis) M(anibus) M(arco) Anneo Paulo Petro, M(arcus) Anneus Paulus filio carissimo.

The tomb and the inscription are purely pagan, as shown by the invocation to the underground gods (*Dii manibus*), which fact can be explained only by supposing father and son to have been relatives of Anneus Seneca the philosopher, whose friendship for Paul the Apostle has been made famous by a tradition dating at least from the beginning of the fourth century. Here also we find a marked preference for the name of Paul over that of Peter, the former being borne by both father and son, while the latter appears only as a surname given to the son. We may safely conclude from these remarks that the invocation of Paul and Peter at San Sebastiano cannot be taken as a proof of a transferment of their mortal spoils to this special locality of the Appian Way.

Fifth. I believe that the true solution of the case is to be found in the first distich of the Epigram of Pope Damasus, which the so-called *Einsidlensis* copied in *basilica sci Sebastiani* about the middle of the eighth century :—

HIC HABITASSE PRIVS SANCTOS COGNOSCERE DEBES
NOMINA QVISQVE PETRI PARITER PAVLIQVE REQVIRIS.

The verb "habitasse" has been explained by the partisans of the theory of a transferment as if it meant "here Peter and Paul have found a temporary place of rest," when it is evident that it must be taken in the literal sense : "here Peter and Paul have *lived*" (while working for the evangelization of Rome). The *memoria*, therefore, consisted of one or more rooms of a private house or of a hostelry, made sacred and august by the temporary residence of the founders of the church. There are to the present day several of these holy rooms in Rome : the one of St. Louis Gonzaga in the Collegio

on the Appian Way

Romano, another of St. Stanislas Kostka in the Noviziato at St. Andrea, a third of St. Philip Neri in the Palazzo Massimi, which, on the anniversary day of their respective patrons, are visited by a large number of devotees.

Sixth. The great veneration in which the *memoria* was held is shown by the number of private tomb-chapels which crowd the site of St. Sebastian. Such are the mausoleum of Quirinus of Siscia, already mentioned in connection with the so-called Platonía, the mausoleum of the Uranii, which at a later age became the baptistery of the church, the so-called *Domus Petri*, and many others which appear in the beautiful plan just published by Dr. Fasiolo.

Seventh. When the church was built, towards the end of the fourth century, no special importance was attached to the fact that the grave of St. Sebastian had been included (intentionally or not) within its area. The church was exclusively dedicated to the memory of the Apostles, as proved by a passage in the Acts of St. Quirinus ("quem via Appia milliario tertio sepelierunt in basilica Apostolorum Petri et Pauli") and by another in the life of Pope Hadrian I (A.D. 772-795), who "ecclesiam Apostolorum foris portam Appiam milliario tertio a novo restauravit." The substitution of the name of St. Sebastian is a comparatively late affair. Let us hope that the second campaign of investigation, which has just been inaugurated, will dissipate the last uncertainties connected with this remarkable incident in the history of the evangelization of Rome.

Other discoveries of great interest to the student of Christian art have been made lately in the church of St. John before the Latin gate, on that promontory of the Cælian Hill known in the Middle Ages by the name of *Calvarello*, and now called *Monte d'Oro*. In May, 1914, Dr. P. Styger having entered at a considerable personal risk the space which separates the modern vaulted ceiling of the presbytery from the ancient

The Memoria Apostolorum

roof, discovered a set of well-preserved frescoes, which had never been seen or described since the revival of classic studies, with the exception of a cursory statement which occurs in Crescimbeni's *Istoria della chiesa di s. Giovanni avanti porta Latina*, p. 74. They cover the front wall of the apse and represent the apocalyptic group of the symbols of the four Gospels and the twenty-four *Seniores*, in two lines of twelve each. These frescoes show no alteration or restoration, and look as fresh as if their unknown author had just put down his brush.

Elated by such a find, Dr. Styger examined the next day the upper zone of the walls of the nave, which were covered with a band of oil pictures on canvas by Paolo Gismondi: and, sure enough, here also he discovered (through a heavy coating of whitewash) another group of frescoes equally precious for their age and style, and for the subjects they represent, borrowed from the Old and the New Testaments.

There are three bands of panels on either wall of the nave, and two only on the wall above the entrance door, which faces the apse. Altogether there are forty-nine scenes, of which thirty-two are derived from the New Testament. Each panel is five feet high. Comparing the style of masonry of the walls with the style of the frescoes and with the paleography of the legends, Styger, Wilpert, Munoz and other eminent experts have come to the conclusion that this stupendous illustration of the Bible belongs to the second half or to the end of the twelfth century. Now there is still affixed to the wall of the porch an inscription describing how Pope Celestinus III in the year 1190 (corr. 1191) had rebuilt *ex novo* this venerable old sanctuary. There is no doubt, therefore, that the fresco paintings of its nave and apse must be considered contemporary with this reconstruction of Celestinus, and must be classified chronologically between the Biblical series of Santa Croce in Gerusalemme, which dates from A.D. 1144, and that of Frater Romanus at Subiaco, which dates from 1228.

on the Appian Way

The two sets of the apse and of the nave, although contemporary, belong to two different schools. The author or the authors of the first followed the tradition of early mediæval Roman art, while those of the second must be considered as pioneers of the new realistic school, as precursors of the Renaissance. From this point of view the discoveries made at St. John *ante portam Latinam* rank among the best ever made in the field of art. We know that the Constantinian basilicas of St. Peter on the Via Cornelia, of St. Paul on the Via Ostiensis, and of St. John the Lateran boasted of the same cycles of Biblical scenes, but very little is known about them. The sets still preserved in the Duomo of Anagni and in the church of St. Urbano alla Caffarella are inferior to those just found, both in number and in style; they can only be compared to advantage with the set of the abbey of St. Peter at Ferentillo, which was composed of sixty-eight panels, of which only thirty-two have escaped total or partial destruction.

RODOLFO LANCIANI.

LA PHILOSOPHIE SCOLASTIQUE ET LA GUERRE

LA guerre actuelle a révélé aux esprits les plus inattentifs l'existence d'une question internationale. Pour qu'une guerre comme celle-ci, si manifestement opposée aux véritables intérêts des peuples en lutte, si contraire aux aspirations de la conscience moderne ait pu se produire, il faut qu'il existe quelque vice fondamental dans l'organisation internationale. Il y a une question internationale, c'est-à-dire un ensemble de problèmes se rapportant aux relations entre les peuples, brutalement posés par la guerre, et qui réclament des solutions conformes à la morale et au droit.

A ces problèmes, les Catholiques peuvent-ils trouver dans leurs doctrines des réponses satisfaisantes ? On en pourrait douter quand on voit les Catholiques des pays belligérants et même des pays neutres divisés dans leurs jugements et dans leurs sympathies, aussi divisés que les fidèles des autres confessions et que les libre-penseurs. Nous pensons cependant que nos doctrines contiennent les fondements philosophiques d'une théorie des rapports internationaux conforme aux besoins les plus pressants de la civilisation moderne et aux plus nobles aspirations de la conscience.

Pour faire de cette affirmation une démonstration complète, il faudrait de longues recherches et des études détaillées. Je me contenterai, dans cet article, d'en examiner un des aspects les plus importants et les plus controversés : la guerre. Y'a-t-il une théorie catholique de la guerre capable de servir de guide à nos jugements et de règle à notre conduite ? Cette théorie existe. Contenue en germe dans les écrits des Pères de l'Eglise, elle fut développée par les philosophes scolastiques et les canonistes, complétée et précisée par les grands théologiens espagnols du XV^e et du XVI^e siècle. En 1911 un français, Monsieur Vanderpol, a eu le rare mérite d'attirer l'attention sur cette théorie, en tra-

La Philosophie Scolastique

duisant les textes principaux des théologiens et des canonistes du moyen âge.* Obscurcie et négligée pendant plusieurs siècles, on la retrouve aujourd'hui professée par des théologiens éminents. Elle n'a jamais reçu du Saint-Siège une approbation formelle et explicite ; mais elle a été considérée pendant des siècles comme la doctrine traditionnelle de l'Eglise et elle a pour elle l'autorité des grands théologiens qui l'ont exposée et défendue.

La philosophie catholique ne condamne pas toute guerre indistinctement. Fondée sur les Ecritures qui font de l'amour du prochain le second des Commandements, elle a horreur de la guerre. "Celui qui peut penser à la guerre," dit St. Augustin, "et la peut supporter sans une grande douleur, celui-la a véritablement perdu le sens humain." Mais elle ne regarde pas la guerre comme un mal absolu qu'il faille toujours éviter sans autre considération. Les calamités qu'elle entraîne à sa suite : les ruines, les privations, les blessures et la mort, si on les endure ou si on les inflige pour une juste cause, ne sont pas des maux au sens moral du mot. La guerre n'est moralement mauvaise que si elle est injuste.

La guerre juste n'est pas opposée à la paix véritable qui réside dans la tranquillité de l'ordre, dans le règne paisible de la Justice.

La guerre n'est pas opposée à la bonne, mais à la mauvaise paix ; elle est au contraire le moyen d'atteindre une paix véritable et sûre. De même elle n'est pas contraire au véritable amour des ennemis : ce sont non les personnes, mais les œuvres que déteste celui qui punit ; et elle ne contrevient pas au précepte du pardon des offenses ; car la vindicte par les voies de droit peut être parfois poursuivie sans aucune injustice.

Les scolastiques n'acceptent donc pas l'interprétation

* *Le Droit de Guerre, d'après les Théologiens et les Canonistes du Moyen Age.* A. Vanderpol. Paris : Tralin. 1911.

† Suarez : *De tripl. virt. theol. De Caritate*, XIII., 1.

La Philosophie Scolastique

que donnent des textes évangéliques les partisans de la nonrésistance chrétienne.

Mais à raison des souffrances physiques et des perturbations morales qu'elle occasionne il faut éviter la guerre autant qu'il est possible. Il faudra n'y recourir qu'à la toute dernière extrémité, après avoir épuisé tous les moyens pacifiques d'obtenir satisfaction. La guerre n'est juste que si elle est nécessaire. Eût-on pour soi tous les droits et les droits les plus évidents, il ne sera pas permis d'y recourir tant qu'il restera un espoir d'amener l'adversaire par la médiation ou l'arbitrage, à une composition amiable.*

Enfin, il importe que celui qui entreprend une guerre juste, la fasse dans une intention droite, avec une âme de justicier qu'aucune passion ne trouble.

Le prince chrétien gardera la charité jusque dans la guerre. Il ne voudra vaincre que pour le bien des vaincus, pour les ramener à la piété et à la justice. Car il est heureux que l'on soit vaincu quand par là, on perd le droit de mal faire.†

Ce qu'on blâme à juste titre dans la guerre, c'est le désir de nuire, la cruauté de la vengeance, une âme implacable ennemie de toute paix, la fureur des représailles, la passion de la domination et autres sentiments semblables.‡

Sous ces réserves générales, les scolastiques admettent la possibilité et la légitimité d'une guerre juste.

Ils distinguent entre la guerre offensive et la guerre défensive. A la première ils ne consacrent que quelques rapides réflexions. La guerre défensive qui consiste à repousser par la force une attaque actuelle injuste, est toujours permise. Ce n'est que l'application aux relations internationales du droit de légitime défense : *Vim vi repellere omnia jura permittunt*. C'est une vérité de bon sens et on en trouve une intéressante application consacrée par le droit international, dans

* Lupus : *De bello et de bellat.*

† St. Augustin : *Epit. 5 id Marcellum.*

‡ St. Augustin : *Contr. Faustum, XXII., 74.*

et la Guerre

la guerre actuelle. La Belgique, pays neutre à titre permanent, n'a pas le droit de se mêler aux conflits armés entre d'autres peuples. D'autre part, elle a le droit de repousser par la force les atteintes à sa neutralité; et cet emploi de la force, d'après une convention de la Haye de 1907, ne peut pas être considéré comme un acte hostile. De sorte que la Belgique, tout en participant à la guerre, par le fait de l'aggression allemande, n'en demeure pas moins juridiquement neutre et en droit strict n'est pas soumise aux mêmes aléas que les autres belligérants.

Les auteurs ne s'arrêtent pas, à cet aspect de la guerre qui ne présente aucune difficulté. Toute leur attention se porte vers la guerre offensive. Comment justifier en morale et en droit la guerre offensive avec les atteintes qu'elle porte à la souveraineté du Prince attaqué, aux propriétés et à la vie de ses sujets ?

Les scolastiques donnent à ce droit un fondement original. Ils en font une variété du droit de punir, de ce qu'on appelle, dans l'école, la justice vindicative.* C'est ici vraiment le point cardinal de la théorie autour duquel pivotent tous les développements que comporte le sujet.

En principe aucun homme ne possède sur un autre homme le droit de vie et de mort. Ce droit n'appartient qu'à Dieu. Mais l'homme est destiné, en vertu d'une loi impérative de sa nature, à vivre en société. La société de ses semblables lui est indispensable, pour pourvoir à ses besoins matériels, pour développer son intelligence et son cœur. Pour atteindre pleinement ce but, la famille ne suffit pas, pas plus que les sociétés

* Il importe pour éviter tout malentendu de définir le sens de certains termes qu'emploient couramment les scolastiques.

Princeps : le Prince, c'est le dépositaire de l'autorité souveraine quel qu'il soit : roi, conseil ou assemblée.

Injuria : injure ou plutôt injustice, c'est-à-dire, un acte contraire au droit.

Vindicare : ne veut pas dire venger ou se venger, mais punir. *Vindicare injuriam*, punir une injustice.

La Philosophie Scolastique

volontaires qui viennent se greffer sur elle. Il faut que ces sociétés particulières soient englobées dans une société plus générale et plus compréhensive : la société civile ou l'Etat. L'Etat est de droit naturel, en ce sens, que dans son origine et son but il ne dépend pas des combinaisons arbitraires des hommes. Il dérive de leur nature même qui les pousse à s'unir pour assurer leur conservation et leur défense.* Aucun Etat n'est possible sans la présence d'un pouvoir public, d'une autorité souveraine, qui coordonne toutes les activités des sujets en vue du but commun. Le pouvoir public découle donc de la nature humaine et de la nature de la société. Il est de droit naturel. Or comme Dieu est l'auteur de la nature et par conséquent le suprême fondement du droit naturel il s'en suit que le pouvoir public vient de Dieu. *Omnis potestas a Deo.*

Pour exercer sa mission le pouvoir public que les scolastiques désignent sous le nom de Prince, doit posséder le droit de punir. Aucune société ne subsisterait si les criminels pouvaient impunément troubler l'ordre. Le Prince peut imposer des peines aux criminels, dans la mesure où ces peines sont nécessaires pour la défense et la conservation de l'ordre social. Dans les cas très graves la peine peut aller jusqu'à la condamnation à mort du coupable. Dans l'exercice de la justice vindicative le Prince est le représentant de Dieu. *Il est, comme dit S. Paul, le ministre de Dieu pour exécuter Sa vengeance contre celui qui fait le mal.* Naturellement le Prince n'exerce le droit de punir que dans les limites de sa juridiction. Il n'a aucun droit sur les sujets d'un Prince étranger et encore bien moins sur le Prince étranger lui-même.

Qu'arrivera-t-il pourtant si des malfaiteurs venus d'un Etat voisin commettent des délits graves contre ses propres sujets ? Il s'adressera au Prince qui a sur ces malfaiteurs le droit de juridiction et il lui demandera satisfaction. Si le Prince refuse, s'il couvre les mal-

* Victoria : *Relect theolog. de potest. civil.*

et la Guerre

fauteurs de sa protection, s'il est lui-même l'agresseur, alors le Prince dont les intérêts ont été lésés aura le droit de faire la guerre.

En présence,* soit de l'inertie du Prince qui a juridiction sur les coupables, soit du fait qu'au lieu de remplir sa mission, il abuse de son autorité pour ordonner à ses sujets des actes blâmables, cette autorité, à *raison de sa faute*, passe au Prince du pays lésé, lequel en vertu de cette autorité momentanée a le droit de juger et de condamner, s'il y a lieu, le Prince et le peuple coupables et de leur déclarer la guerre qui, ainsi qu'on le voit, n'est autre chose que d'exécution d'une sentence judiciaire.

Le théorie peut paraître subtile et elle l'est effectivement. Elle constitue un effort dialectique pour faire rentrer la guerre, cette procédure violente et dangereuse, dans la sphère du droit et lui tracer ainsi des directions et des limites. En fait elle est bâtie sur une suite de raisonnements solidement enchaînés les uns ou autres.

De même que la paix ne pourrait pas régner dans un Etat s'il n'existait pas une puissance chargée de punir les crimes des sujets ; de même pour que la paix règne dans la société des nations, il faut qu'on trouve une puissance capable de punir les atteintes portées par un Etat aux droits d'un autre Etat. Or cette puissance n'existe dans aucun supérieur temporel. Au dessus de l'Etat souverain il n'y a aucun pouvoir politique. L'Etat est une société parfaite qui doit trouver en elle-même tous les éléments nécessaires à son existence. Dès lors il faudra bien que le droit de punir réside dans le souverain de l'Etat lésé auquel l'autre Etat se trouve momentanément soumis, à raison de son délit. Le Souverain dont le droit a été violé peut déclarer une guerre offensive qui devient l'exécution d'une sentence de justice vindicative. "Celui qui a juste guerre," dit Cajetan†

remplit le rôle d'un juge en matière criminelle. . . . Il n'est pas partie, mais en raison même de la cause nécessaire de la guerre,

* Vanderpol : *loc. cit.* p. 18.

† Summula : *Verbo. Bellum.*

La Philosophie Scolastique

il est juge des ennemis ; pour la même raison il peut de sa propre autorité, user du glaive contre les perturbateurs intérieurs et extérieurs de l'ordre ; cette raison c'est la perfection de l'Etat. Ce ne serait pas en effet, un Etat parfait, celui qui n'aurait point le pouvoir de punir, conformément à la justice, ceux qui troubleraient sa tranquillité, qu'ils soient des citoyens ou des étrangers.

On pourrait multiplier les citations de ce genre sans autre utilité que d'engendrer la monotonie à force de répétitions. Cette doctrine est universellement admise au moyen âge et elle est explicitement professée par Victoria et Suarez. Elle est un peu abstraite mais d'une importance capitale tant au point de vue des conséquences qu'on en peut déduire, que des applications qu'on en peut faire aux conditions politiques modernes.

La première conséquence, c'est que la guerre, sauf le cas d'ignorance invincible, ne peut jamais être juste des deux côtés à la fois. En effet il y a d'un côté, un délinquant, un criminel ; de l'autre un juge qui est en même temps l'exécuteur de sa propre sentence judiciaire. La guerre ne peut donc pas être assimilée à un duel. C'était la doctrine païenne et particulièrement la doctrine romaine.

Les Romains croyaient que les guerres entreprises contre les ennemis de Rome étaient justes de part et d'autre : ils admettaient en effet que l'on combattait d'un commun accord, en vertu d'une sorte de pacte tacite, d'après lequel celui qui serait vainqueur devenait légitime possesseur des biens du vaincu. (Suarez.)

Là où il n'y a pas de faute, il n'y a pas place à une sentence de justice criminelle, il n'y a pas guerre juste. A plus forte raison les guerres de conquêtes sont injustes et défendues.

Faire la guerre à ses voisins pour s'élancer à de nouveaux combats, dit St. Augustin, écraser, réduire les peuples dont on n'a reçu aucune offense, seulement par appétit de domination, qu'est ce autre chose qu'un immense brigandage.

Parmi les causes injustes de guerre Victoria cite : (1) la différence de religion ; (2) l'extension de l'empire ;

et la Guerre

(3) la gloire du Prince ou tout autre avantage qui lui serait propre. Et à ce propos il fait une remarque particulièrement intéressante à une époque démocratique comme la nôtre.

Le Prince doit tout ordonner, la paix comme la guerre pour le bien commun de l'Etat : il n'a pas le droit de dépenser les revenus publics, encore bien moins d'exposer ses sujets à de graves périls, dans son propre intérêt et pour sa propre gloire.

La guerre ne peut être déclarée pour trancher un conflit d'intérêt ou d'opinion. Vasquez * se pose la question.

N'est-il pas admissible qu'une guerre soit juste des deux côtés sans qu'aucun des adversaires soit coupable d'une faute; mais que l'on résolve ainsi par les armes la controverse de deux opinions également probables ?

Admettre qu'une guerre, hors le cas d'ignorance peut être juste d'une part et d'autre, en elle-même; que l'on puisse, après examen des arguments des parties, mettre fin au débat ou à la querelle par la guerre, c'est une chose inouïe. Les débats d'opinion doivent se résoudre par la raison et non par les armes. *Et puisque, ainsi que nous l'avons démontré, le jugement d'un seul Prince est insuffisant pour terminer le litige, il s'en suit nécessairement qu'il faut recourir à une tierce personne.*

Ce passage de Vasquez mérite de retenir l'attention. Il présente sous un aspect nouveau la théorie traditionnelle. Les divergences d'opinions, et on peut ajouter sans forcer la signification du texte, les divergences d'intérêt, ne peuvent pas donner occasion à une guerre juste. "La seule raison d'une guerre juste," dit le même auteur, est de punir, par mesure de justice vindicative, quelqu'un qui a mérité une peine, pour une faute réellement commise, ou tout au moins qu'on a le droit de présumer.

Or les causes les plus fréquentes des guerres dérivent précisément de divergences d'opinions engendrées par des intérêts politiques ou économiques divergents. Par leur nature même, ces questions ne sont pas susceptibles d'être soumises à l'arbitrage. L'arbitrage n'est applicable que dans les cas où les prétentions contradictoires

* *Comment. en Second Part. St. Thom. Disput. LXIV., cap. 3.*

La Philosophie Scolastique

peuvent être formulées juridiquement et où le litige peut être clos par une sentence judiciaire. Il semble que nous aboutissions à une impasse. Que faire ?

Il faut d'abord se tenir ferme au principe que la guerre en pareille hypothèse serait injuste, puis chercher, en dehors de l'arbitrage, les moyens d'arriver à une solution amiable. Vasquez lui-même en indique un, le recours à une tierce personne ou la médiation.

Le médiateur diffère de l'arbitre en ce qu'il ne rend pas de sentence et ne termine pas le conflit. C'est un amiable intermédiaire. Il s'efforce de concilier les intérêts, d'adoucir les aspérités, de fournir aux parties litigantes une base d'entente. Il donne son avis sur les propositions des deux parties.

La médiation d'une ou de plusieurs Puissances a réussi plusieurs fois au cours du XIX^e siècle à éteindre de dangereux conflits qui pouvaient aboutir à la guerre. C'est un excellent moyen de terminer amiablement un litige qui par sa nature même ne se prête pas à l'arbitrage. Aussi les Puissances ont affirmé plusieurs fois, sous une forme solennelle, le devoir de recourir à la médiation avant d'en appeler aux armes. La Conférence de Paris de 1856 sous les pressantes instigations de MM. Henri Richard et Sturge, membres de la Société des Amis de la Paix, adopta le protocole suivant :

MM. les plénipotentiaires n'hésitent pas à exprimer au nom de leur gouvernement le vœu que les Etats entre lesquels s'élèverait un dissentiment sérieux, avant d'en appeler aux armes, eussent recours en temps que les circonstances l'admettraient, aux bons offices d'une Puissance amie.

Les Conférences de la Haye ont été plus loin. Elles ont consacré à la médiation et aux bons offices plusieurs articles destinés à en préciser le fonctionnement et la procédure. Les stipulations des conventions de la Haye sont suffisamment claires et complètes pour ouvrir la voie à la solution amiable d'un conflit si les Puissances intéressées étaient persuadées qu'il y a pour elles une obligation morale impérieuse à éviter une guerre injuste.

et la Guerre

Un autre moyen, plus important, plus difficile à mettre en œuvre mais d'une efficacité éprouvée, c'est la réunion d'un congrès ou d'une conférence des Puissances. Les congrès sont en quelque sorte les organes législatifs rudimentaires de la société des nations. Ils reposent sur cette conviction affirmée ou tacite que les nations civilisées font partie d'une communauté réelle, supérieure aux Etats particuliers. Il arrive, et c'est aujourd'hui presque toujours le cas en Europe, qu'un conflit qui en apparence n'intéresse que deux Puissances, menace de dégénérer en conflagration générale. Une conférence offre un excellent moyen d'évoquer la cause en litige, de l'étudier non pas du seul point de vue des Puissances directement intéressées, mais du point de vue plus élevé de la paix du monde, et de la terminer par une solution juste et amiable.

On le voit, dès aujourd'hui les Etats civilisés possèdent plusieurs moyens pour éviter de recourir aux armes dans les cas où la philosophie scolastique n'admet pas la possibilité d'une juste guerre. Certes ces moyens ne sont pas parfaits, mais rien ne serait plus aisé que de les perfectionner et d'en faire des institutions régulières, de la vie internationale.* Ce qui manque, c'est dans les gouvernements comme dans les sujets la conviction pratique que la morale s'impose à l'action des Etats comme à celle des individus ; qu'un peuple n'a pas plus de droit qu'un particulier de commettre un acte injuste, que parmi les guerres les unes sont justes et les autres injustes et qu'il faut éviter les dernières par tous les moyens honorables. C'est là précisément ce qui distingue la doctrine scolastique sur la guerre des autres théories. Elle ne sépare pas la politique de la morale et du droit. La loi morale est pour elle d'une application universelle.

Le Prince dont le droit est lésé prononce le jugement

* Voir sur l'évolution de la médiation et son perfectionnement possible "L'avenir de la médiation," par N. Politis. *Revue générale de Droit international public*. 1910. P. 136.

La Philosophie Scolastique

et exécute la sentence. Il est donc juge et il doit agir comme tel. Il lui faudra examiner avec grand soin^a la justice et les causes de la guerre, écouter les arguments des adversaires, si ceux-ci veulent discuter *ex æquo et bono*. Il devra prendre l'avis des gens qui sachent parler librement, sans colère, sans haine, sans partialité. En effet dans les questions morales, il est difficile de discerner ce qui est juste et vrai, et par suite, on se trompera facilement si on les étudie légèrement. Les mêmes obligations s'imposent aux grands du royaume, à ceux qui sont admis aux conseils de l'Etat, soit qu'ils y soient appelés soit qu'ils soient libres d'y venir eux-mêmes. Tous ont le devoir d'examiner sérieusement, impartialement, la justice de la guerre. Et ce devoir est d'autant plus impérieux qu'une erreur de jugement entraînera la mort et le malheur d'une foule d'hommes : par suite, ce n'est pas le seul avis du roi, ce n'est pas l'avis de quelques-uns, mais l'opinion d'un grand nombre d'hommes et d'hommes vertueux qui doit décider de la guerre.

Transportons ces prescriptions dans le milieu moderne, situons les dans la vivante atmosphère de notre activité politique, et demandons nous ce qu'elles impliquent. Qui décide aujourd'hui de la guerre et de la paix, en droit et en fait dans nos sociétés démocratiques ? Le Roi, les ministres, le parlement, la presse, l'opinion publique manifestée par les mouvements des foules dans la rue et dans les meetings. A tous, la première question qui devrait se poser ce n'est pas de savoir si l'armée est prête, si les conjonctures politiques, économiques et financières sont favorables.

Pour importantes qu'soient ces questions, il y en a une autre qui les précède et les dépasse en importance, à laquelle il faut répondre avant tout. La guerre que nous allons faire, est-elle juste ? Il suffit d'énoncer ces propositions, de se remémorer les événements qui précèdent les déclarations de guerre, pour mesurer combien nous sommes éloignés de l'idéal incorporé dans la doctrine scolastique.

^a Victoria : *De jure belli*. Résumé de son opinion.

et la Guerre

Si, après tout examiné, le Prince est certain de son droit, il pourra déclarer la guerre. Mais avant de l'entamer

il est * tenu d'exposer à l'Etat adverse la juste cause de la guerre et de demander une réparation convenable. Si l'adversaire accepte de la lui donner il est tenu de l'accepter et d'abandonner la guerre ; sinon celle-ci sera injuste ; mais si l'adversaire refuse de donner satisfaction, il aura le droit de commencer justement la guerre.

“ Quand vous approcherez d'une ville pour l'assiéger,” dit le Deutéronome, “ d'abord vous lui offrirez la paix.”

Nos lecteurs se rappelleront, avec quelle touchante naïveté Jeanne d'Arc, cette pure merveille de l'héroïsme et du patriotisme chrétien, obéissait sur ce point spécial aux principes de la morale chrétienne. A peine arrivée sous les murs d'Orléans, elle adresse une lettre aux assiégés.

Rendez à la Pucelle, ici envoyée de par le Roi du ciel, les clefs de toutes les bonnes villes que vous avez prises et volées en France. . . . Elle est prête à faire la paix, si vous voulez lui faire raison.

Les assiégés retiennent prisonnier le héraut qui avait apporté la lettre et menacent de le brûler. Elle ne se décourage pas. Elle en envoie une seconde, elle en envoie une troisième. Entretemps, elle s'avance elle-même, au péril de sa vie, jusque sous les remparts de la ville, pour exhorter les ennemis à se retirer sans combattre. Elle ne recueille que des injures grossières et des menaces. Alors comprenant que ses efforts sont inutiles, qu'il lui faudra combattre et verser le sang, elle se mit à soupirer et à pleurer abondamment en invoquant le Roi du ciel à son aide.

Rappelons sans y insister qu'au début de la guerre actuelle la Serbie, répondant à l'ultimatum impérial de l'Autriche, se soumet à *toutes* ses exigences sauf sur deux points. Sur l'un elle demande des explications. Elle se refuse à acquiescer à l'autre parce que cela impliquerait

* Suarez : *De trip. virt. theol. De Carit.* Pars III., Disput. XIII., Section VII. 3.

La Philosophie Scolastique

une atteinte grave à son droit de souveraineté. Mais elle ajoute :

Le gouvernement royal serbe considérant qu'il est de l'intérêt commun de ne pas précipiter la solution de cette question est prêt comme toujours à accepter une entente pacifique, en remettant cette question soit à la décision du tribunal international de la Haye, soit aux grandes puissances qui ont pris part à la déclaration que le gouvernement serbe a faite le 18/31 Mars, 1909.

Il n'est pas douteux, si on accepte la théorie scolastique, que l'Autriche n'avait pas de droit d'entamer les hostilités et que le seul fait de repousser les satisfactions offertes par la Serbie rendait la guerre injuste. Il n'y a pas de difficulté si le droit du Prince est évident et si son adversaire ne le conteste pas.

La question devient délicate en cas de doute. Si les adversaires affirment des droits opposés, même si ces droits ne sont pas égaux, nous n'avons plus cette évidence de la faute qui rend la guerre juste. Les théologiens qui ont particulièrement étudié cette question, comme Vasquez, Victoria, et Suarez, se sont naturellement laissés influencer par les conditions de leur époque. C'est en se basant sur des cas qui se posaient de leur temps qu'ils ont essayé de dégager les principes. L'hypothèse qu'ils choisissent le plus volontiers comme objet de leurs subtiles et minutieuses analyses, c'est la revendication d'un royaume par deux princes. Mais nous pouvons faire abstraction de tout ce qui est particulier à l'hypothèse choisie, et de tout ce qui s'applique aux relations féodales, pour nous en tenir à l'essentiel, c'est à dire le doute sur la droit.

Dans ce cas Suarez suggère trois solutions. La première ne s'applique complètement qu'à l'hypothèse choisie, mais elle trouverait cependant de nos jours de fréquentes applications dans les controverses ayant pour objet les territoires coloniaux. Suarez suppose que le royaume est vacant, c'est-à-dire, qu'il n'a pas de possesseur légitime. Dans ce cas les princes se diviseront l'objet du conflit, où le tireront au sort, où bien par tout autre moyen termineront le litige sans recourir à la

et la Guerre

guerre. La seconde solution c'est l'arbitrage. Suarez se demande si en cas de doute les souverains sont obligés de s'en rapporter à l'arbitrage de gens de bien.

Je crois * que l'affirmative est très probable : car on est tenu d'éviter la guerre par tous les moyens possibles et honnêtes. Si donc il n'y a aucune injustice à redouter c'est de beaucoup le meilleur moyen et il faut l'employer en effet, il est impossible que l'auteur de la nature ait laissé les choses humaines, qui sont plus souvent régies par des conjectures que par des certitudes, dans un état si critique, que tous les conflits entre les souverains et les Etats ne puissent se terminer que par la guerre : ce serait contraire à la prudence et au bien général du genre humain, donc contraire à la justice. Il en résulterait, en outre, que les plus puissants posséderaient régulièrement plus que les autres, et que la force des armes serait la mesure des droits, ce qui serait aussi absurde que barbare.

Mais l'arbitrage à l'époque du Suarez était peu usité. Les souverains s'en défiaient. Aujourd'hui une telle défiance serait déplacée, et si on refuse de recourir à l'arbitrage dans les cas où il s'impose, c'est ou bien qu'on cache de secrets desseins de conquête, ou bien qu'on a de la souveraineté de l'Etat une notion incompatible avec la morale chrétienne.

Enfin Suarez propose une troisième solution qui ne manque pas d'intérêt :

Enfin, ajoute-t-il, il faut remarquer que le Souverain, agissant de bonne foi, peut faire examiner ses droits par des hommes prudents et savants et que, si leur opinion est que son droit est évident, il peut la suivre et n'est pas tenu de s'en rapporter à d'autres.

Les raisons qu'il apporte méritent d'être rappelées, car elles permettent de faire certaines distinctions qui ont encore leur importance de nos jours.

... Il faut juger de son droit comme d'une juste contestation ; car dans un juste jugement il y a deux choses à considérer : l'examen de la cause et la connaissance du droit des deux parties ; pour cela point n'est besoin de juridiction, mais bien de science et de prudence. Cela n'est pas le but de la guerre, c'est au con-

* Suarez : *loc. cit.* s. VI. 5.

La Philosophie Scolastique

traire ce qui sert de base à la guerre, et l'on ne voit pas dès lors pourquoi on recourrait à des arbitres. Autre chose est l'exécution du droit ainsi établi : ici il faut une juridiction que le Souverain possède par lui-même, quand, d'autre part son droit est suffisamment évident.

Quand il recourt à un arbitrage, le Prince renonce en quelque sorte à son droit de porter lui-même le jugement. L'arbitre clôt le débat juridique par une sentence définitive à laquelle les deux parties litigantes sont tenues d'obéir. Il se peut qu'un Souverain ne désire pas se dépouiller de son droit de juger la cause, et que d'autre part il entende se prononcer en toute justice. Suarez lui offre un moyen, c'est de faire examiner ses prétentions par des hommes prudents et savants et d'agir ensuite, c'est-à-dire, de juger lui-même et de se décider selon l'avis de ces hommes.

Cette solution offre cependant toujours un grave inconvénient. Il s'agit en l'hypothèse d'un différend qui divise deux Princes, c'est-à-dire, d'un différend international. Or l'un des Princes se réserve le droit de désigner lui seul sous sa responsabilité les hommes prudents et sages auxquels il remettra l'étude de sa cause. Cela peut lui suffire au point de vue de sa conscience, cela n'est pas suffisant au point de vue du droit international. Aussi la science moderne a réalisé la pensée exprimée par Saurez sous une forme préférable, au moyen d'une institution qui tient en quelque sorte le milieu entre la médiation et l'arbitrage : c'est la commission internationale d'enquête. Les conférences de la Haye ont déterminé la nature, la composition de ces commissions et la procédure à suivre. En principe leur rôle se borne à éclairer "par un examen impartial et consciencieux les questions de fait." Les questions de droit seraient donc exclues.

Mais la distinction* du fait et du droit est plus théorique que pratique ; souvent, entre les éléments de fait et les éléments de

* "Les commissions internationales d'enquêtes," par N. Politis. *Revue générale de droit international public*. Année 1912. P. 149 et seq.

et la Guerre

droit du débat, il y a des liens si étroits qu'on ne peut constater les uns sans toucher aux autres ; parfois aussi l'aspect juridique de la contestation est extrêmement simple, sa solution apparaît d'elle-même et elle s'impose, sans plus ample examen, dès que les faits sont constatés.

C'est ce qui est apparu lors de la fameuse affaire de Hull qui en 1904 faillit provoquer une guerre entre l'Angleterre et la Russie.

La flotte russe de l'amiral Rojetstvensky crut reconnaître des torpilleurs ennemis parmi les chalutiers anglais qui pêchaient aux environs de Hull. Elle ouvrit le feu sur l'ennemi supposé, tua deux hommes, en blessa six, coula un bateau, en endommagea cinq autres et s'éloigna sans même porter secours aux victimes. Grâce à l'intervention de la France une rupture fut évitée. On constitua à Paris une commission d'enquête d'après les prescriptions de la convention de la Haye. Or la convention formula à la fois des conclusions sur la question de fait et sur la question de droit sans soulever de protestation des parties intéressées. C'était d'ailleurs inévitable.

Telle qu'elle a fonctionné, la commission internationale d'enquête correspond donc bien à la proposition de Vasquez. Elle s'est prononcée sur les questions de droit et de fait au sujet desquelles des parties en désaccord menaçaient d'en venir aux mains. De plus la commission se borna à déposer un rapport laissant aux intéressés la liberté d'agir au mieux de leurs intérêts. Ces commissions n'agissent pas comme arbitres, elles ne prononcent pas de jugement. Ce ne sont pas d'avantage des médiateurs chargés d'une mission de conciliation. Ce sont des réunions d'hommes "prudents et savants" qui donnent un avis motivé dans une cause embrouillée.

Cette théorie du droit de guerre, toute séduisante qu'elle soit, au point de vue moral, soulève pourtant bien des objections. Les plus importantes d'entre elles, les plus décisives n'ont pas échappé aux philosophes scolastiques. Il y en a une qui est capitale. Le Prince qui

La Philosophie Scolastique

est partie intéressée au débat, devient le juge et l'exécuteur de la sentence. Dans la vie civile, il est défendu de se faire justice à soi-même. Le choix des juges est entouré d'une foule de garanties destinées à assurer leur impartialité. L'exécution de la sentence est confiée à un pouvoir distinct du pouvoir judiciaire. Or voici, qu'en matière de conflits internationaux les scolastiques réunissent dans une même personne des qualifications contradictoires qui hurlent de se trouver ensemble : partie, juge, exécuteur.

Suarez a prévu l'objection et il a essayé d'y répondre. Il lui oppose l'argument de nécessité :

La seule raison, dit-il, c'est ce que cet acte de justice vindicative est nécessaire au genre humain et qu'il n'y a aucun autre moyen de le réaliser.

A l'époque où Suarez écrivait, cet argument avait sa pleine valeur. Il n'y avait en effet aucune autorité supérieure aux Princes, capable de trancher par voie de droit les différends qui s'élevaient entre eux et d'imposer son jugement. La Pape n'avait pas de juridiction temporelle directe sur les Princes. L'autorité de l'Empereur était plus nominale que réelle et d'ailleurs d'une application restreinte. Aujourd'hui, comme autrefois, il n'existe aucune autorité temporelle supérieure aux souverainetés nationales. D'aucuns considèrent comme désirable et possible la constitution des Etats-Unis d'Europe sous une forme fédérative analogue à la constitution des Etats-Unis d'Amérique. C'est une utopie et une utopie malsaine. Il est bon que les nations continuent à développer leur génie propre en pleine indépendance. La variété des civilisations nationales est un bien pour l'humanité comme la variété des dons individuels et des vocations est un bien pour la nation.

Mais ce qui est nouveau, ce qui n'existait pas à l'époque de Suarez, c'est un tribunal international organisé par les Etats souverains eux-mêmes et capable de juger les causes qui lui seraient volontairement déferées. Jusqu'à la fin du XIX^e siècle, il n'existait

et la Guerre

aucune institution permanente d'arbitrage à laquelle les Etats entre lesquels s'élevait un conflit, pouvaient remettre le jugement de la cause. Les Etats désireux de terminer pacifiquement un différend devaient s'entendre au préalable, sur le principe même de l'arbitrage, sur le choix des arbitres, sur l'objet précis de l'arbitrage et la procédure à suivre. On comprend aisément, qu'au milieu de l'excitation causée par l'avènement d'un conflit capable de déclencher la guerre, il était difficile aux parties de s'entendre sur tous ces points délicats. Aujourd'hui la situation est toute différente. La Conférence de la Paix de 1899 a constitué à la Haye, sous le nom de Cour permanente d'Arbitrage, une juridiction internationale à laquelle peuvent toujours recourir les parties.

C'est là une innovation capitale, qui énerve complètement l'argument de nécessité invoqué par Suarez. Il n'est plus nécessaire que le Prince soit lui-même le juge dans sa propre cause. Il existe aujourd'hui une cour composée d'un certain nombre d'arbitres parmi lesquels les Etats peuvent choisir le tribunal auquel ils confieront un litige déterminé.

La même convention complétée par la convention de 1907 a élaboré en détail la procédure à suivre par la cour. Il existe un bureau permanent qui sert de greffe. Il y a enfin un conseil administratif permanent chargé d'organiser le bureau, de notifier la composition du tribunal et de faire tous les règlements nécessaires. La soumission d'une cause à un tribunal de ce genre ne peut porter atteinte à la souveraineté des Etats. C'est par un accord volontairement accepté, après longue discussion, qu'en vue de perfectionner le statut juridique de la société des nations, les Etats ont consenti à organiser la cour permanente d'arbitrage. D'ailleurs le recours à cette juridiction reste volontaire. Aucune Puissance extérieure ne peut contraindre un Etat à s'en servir.

Même si l'arbitrage devenait obligatoire, ce qui à notre avis serait un progrès, cette obligation ne porterait pas atteinte à la souveraineté. La souveraineté ne consiste pas dans le pouvoir de faire tout ce que l'on veut,

La Philosophie Scolastique

sans règle ni obligation morale d'aucune sorte. L'arbitrage obligatoire s'il était accepté, résulterait du libre consentement des Etats et n'obligerait que ceux qui auraient volontairement adhéré à la convention. Il est vrai qu'en général les Etats sont d'accord pour soustraire à l'arbitrage tout ce qui concerne leur honneur, leur indépendance, leurs intérêts vitaux. On se demande sur quoi repose une pareille exclusion.

Aucune de ces questions n'échappe au domaine du droit. Les intérêts vitaux sont susceptibles de s'exprimer en termes de droits tout aussi bien qu'en les intérêts secondaires. Pour le nier il faudrait supposer qu'il existe pour les nations une morale particulière contraire et supérieure à la morale tout court. Or c'est la même morale qui régit les rapports entre les individus et entre les nations. Comme le fait très justement remarquer M. Oppenheim, professeur de droit international à l'Université de Cambridge, les particuliers n'hésitent pas à soumettre au jugement des tribunaux les questions intéressant leur honneur, leur indépendance économique et leurs intérêts vitaux. Que faudrait-il d'après lui, pour que les controverses qui se déroulent autour de ces importants objets soient soumises à une juridiction internationale? Trois choses :* (1) fixer en termes clairs les règles juridiques qui doivent présider aux rapports internationaux, (2) trouver des hommes impartiaux et indépendants auxquels les Etats ne craindraient pas de soumettre leurs litiges, (3) réunir ces hommes en une cour de justice internationale indépendante. Dès aujourd'hui ces conditions sont en partie réalisées. Avec un peu de bonne volonté, en rendant périodiques les conférences de la Haye, il ne serait pas difficile de les réaliser complètement. Donc l'argument de nécessité invoqué par Suarez ne porte plus, tandis que les inconvénients résultant de la confusion dans la personne du Prince, des qualités de partie, de juge et d'exécuteur, continuent à subsister.

* Cf. *Die Zukunft des Völkerrechts*.

et la Guerre

Si la guerre n'est juste que comme exécution d'une sentence judiciaire, il en résulte qu'aujourd'hui la guerre n'est juste que si elle est préalablement soumise à l'arbitrage et si la partie en faute refuse d'exécuter la sentence. Sans doute on peut toujours objecter que le recours à l'arbitrage est libre, et que même s'il était obligatoire, aucune force ne pourrait contraindre l'Etat recalcitrant. Cela est vrai physiquement. Mais au point de vue moral, et c'est le point de vue auquel se placent les scolastiques, les Etats me paraissent obligés de soumettre leurs conflits à l'arbitrage avant de recourir aux armes, parce qu'ils le peuvent sans porter atteinte à leur souveraineté et sans craindre légitimement de voir, je ne dis pas leurs intérêts, mais leur droit compromis.

Supposons réalisées toutes les conditions d'une juste guerre aggressive, le Prince peut-il la déclarer sans autre considération ?

Pas encore. Le Prince a la charge, la responsabilité du bien commun du royaume. C'est en vue de ce bien qu'il fait la guerre. Ce qu'il veut ou doit vouloir c'est châtier un coupable, lui infliger une peine exemplaire, pour atteindre à une paix durable et plus assurée. Si cependant, il était évident ou même simplement probable que la guerre offensive, juste dans son principe et ses conditions, doit attirer à l'Etat plus de maux que de biens, le Prince n'aurait pas le droit de l'entreprendre.

De plus, un Etat particulier fait partie du monde, de la société des nations. Si un Etat doit retirer de la guerre les avantages probables, mais qu'il doive en résulter pour le monde des maux considérables, encore une fois le Prince ne peut pas faire la guerre. Que les lecteurs me permettent de citer deux textes de Victoria. Ils sont un peu longs, mais il me paraissent caractéristiques et susceptibles d'applications fécondes.

Il se peut que le droit de reprendre une ville ou une province existe, et que cependant la guerre soit tout à fait illicite, à cause

La Philosophie Scolastique

des calamités qui en résulteraient. Les guerres, nous l'avons vu, doivent être entreprises dans l'intérêt général ; si donc une ville ne peut être reprise qu'au prix de maux considérables pour l'Etat, au prix de la dévastation de nombreuses cités, de la mort d'un très grand nombre d'hommes, si elle doit amener des inimitiés entre Princes, ou provoquer de nouvelles guerres pour le plus grand mal de l'Eglise, le Prince doit sans aucun doute renoncer à son droit et s'abstenir de la guerre. (Victoria : *De jure belli*, 33.)

Une guerre n'est pas juste, s'il est évident qu'il doit en résulter pour l'Etat plus de mal que de bien et d'utilité, même s'il existe d'autre part, de justes titres et de justes motifs pour la faire. Il est aisé de le démontrer. L'Etat n'a le droit de déclarer la guerre que pour se protéger, se défendre, lui et ce qui est à lui. Si la guerre doit avoir pour résultat, non d'augmenter mais de diminuer sa puissance, s'il doit en sortir écrasé, elle sera injuste, que ce soit l'Etat ou le Roi qui la déclare. Il y a plus : une province chrétienne fait partie de l'Etat, et l'Etat fait partie du monde ; si donc une guerre est utile à une seule province ou à un seul Etat, mais doit entraîner de grands dommages pour le monde entier ou pour la chrétienté, j'estime qu'une telle guerre est injuste. (Victoria : *De potestate civil.*, 13.)

De ces textes, il semble qu'on puisse tirer deux deductions, l'une particulière, l'autre tout à fait générale.

L'Autriche savait que toute tentative d'action violente contre la Serbie entraînerait l'intervention de la Russie. C'était un lieu commun de la politique internationale. L'intervention de la Russie allait, par le jeu naturel des alliances, entraîner l'intervention de l'Allemagne, peut-être de l'Italie, certainement de la France, et de l'Angleterre si la neutralité de la Belgique était violée. C'était la conflagration de l'Europe, avec ses hécatombes, ses ruines ; bref un cortège de maux inouïs. Quand la guerre sera terminée, l'Europe, au point de vue économique et démographique, sera épuisée. Sans compter toutes les peines morales et les rancunes qui resteront plantées dans les cœurs comme des flèches empoisonnées. Et bien, devant ces perspectives l'Autriche, eut elle mille fois raison, n'avait pas semble-t-il le droit, ni vis-à-vis de ses peuples, ni vis-à-vis de l'Europe de déchaîner la guerre.

et la Guerre

Mais je vais plus loin et je me demande si, devant les leçons de la guerre actuelle, devant les progrès considérables des moyens de règlement pacifique des conflits une guerre offensive en Europe peut encore être juste. Voici exactement comment la question se pose.

Un Etat à la veille de commencer une guerre offensive en Europe, pour obtenir réparation d'un droit violé et sans avoir épuisé tous les moyens de conciliation devra peser d'une part l'avantage au point de vue de la paix et de sa sécurité, qu'il y a pour lui à commencer la guerre ; d'autre part les maux qui en résulteront pour son peuple et pour l'Europe. D'après Victoria si la somme des maux l'emporte sur le bien espéré il n'a pas le droit de poursuivre, les armes à la main, la revendication de ses prétentions légitimes. Ne semble-t-il pas qu'on puisse répondre que dans l'état actuel de l'Europe, et du monde, la somme des maux qu'entraîne après elle, une guerre est trop grande pour qu'il soit moralement permis de la déclencher ?

Un auteur anglais, qui se dissimule sous le pseudonyme de Norman Angell, a écrit, sous le titre *The Great Illusion*, un ouvrage qui a eu un grand retentissement. La grande illusion consiste à croire qu'une guerre même victorieuse puisse procurer au vainqueur des avantages économiques. Les guerres modernes ne paient pas. Elles se soldent en déficit. L'ouvrage est curieux, intéressant, rempli d'idées justes qui voisinent avec beaucoup d'idées fausses ou incomplètes, de paradoxes et d'erreurs manifestes. C'est un point de vue mesquin et faux que d'envisager une guerre comme une opération commerciale susceptible de s'exprimer dans les termes d'un bilan, avec un actif, un passif et un solde. Cependant ce qui s'impose à la considération c'est le caractère particulièrement onéreux et cruel des guerres contemporaines. Elles diffèrent du tout au tout d'avec les guerres antérieures, et le théâtre sur lequel elles se déploient est lui-même entièrement transformé. Autrefois les armées en lutte n'embrassaient qu'une faible partie de la population mâle. Tandis qu'on se battait, la vie économique

La Philosophie Scolastique

suivait son cours, à peine troublée à la surface. Les paysans ensemençaient leurs champs et récoltaient leurs moissons. Les artisans continuaient leur tâche quotidienne.

Aujourd'hui, pour peu que la guerre dure, c'est toute la population mâle de 18 à 45 ans qui est mobilisée. Toute la vie économique s'organise en vue d'un but unique : la guerre. Les engins de destruction se sont perfectionnés d'une façon inouïe et la prochaine guerre nous réserve vraisemblablement des surprises nouvelles. Une seule bataille coûte aujourd'hui des milliers de vie humaines. C'est une boucherie indescrivable. Si les Alliés, en France, voulaient percer la ligne ennemie, il est probable qu'ils le pourraient, mais c'est par centaines de mille qu'on compterait les victimes. Les canons à longue portée vont chercher en tâtonnant à l'arrière les villes, les villages, les troupes en marche ou au cantonnement, les reliques de longs siècles de civilisation pour les incendier ou les réduire en poudre.

Ajoutez à cela les dépenses énormes, les milliards gaspillés pour entretenir des armées qui sont des peuples en marche, pour les convoier, les ravitailler en vivres et en munitions, ramener les blessés du front : 11 milliards de francs par mois pour l'Angleterre, la France, la Russie, l'Italie et l'Allemagne. Supposez ensuite, si vous le pouvez, les souffrances, les misères et les ruines des régions envahies. Outre cela ces batailles qui se déploient sur des fronts interminables tendent à devenir aussi indécises qu'elles sont meurtrières. La guerre moderne paraît devoir dégénérer en une guerre de tranchées sur un front immense, sans qu'un des deux adversaires puisse parvenir à écraser l'autre. Même le vainqueur, s'il y en a un, sortira de la lutte épuisé, amputé du meilleur de sa population mâle, ruiné par les frais de guerre et le ralentissement de ses forces productives amoindri sous tous les rapports.

Faisons vivre par l'imagination ces données sèches et incomplètes ; relisons le passage de Victoria : " Si une guerre est utile (?) à une seule province ou à un seul

et la Guerre

Etat mais doit entraîner de grands dommages pour le monde entier et pour la Chrétienté j'estime qu'une telle guerre est injuste." Et demandons-nous si une guerre européenne offensive peut encore apparaître comme justifiée au tribunal de la conscience chrétienne.

La distinction fondamentale entre la guerre juste et la guerre injuste entraîne une foule de conséquences importantes qu'il m'est impossible de passer en revue. Je me contenterai d'en signaler quelques unes qui trouvent leur application dans la guerre actuelle. Celui qui a guerre injuste n'a pas le droit de se défendre. Il doit se soumettre, tout comme le malfaiteur doit se soumettre au gendarme lancé à sa poursuite. Si le sujet du Prince est convaincu de l'injustice de la guerre, il ne lui est pas permis de se battre et doit refuser d'obéir à l'ordre du Prince.

Aucune autorité, dit Victoria,* ne peut ordonner la mise à mort d'un innocent, or dans ce cas les ennemis sont des innocents ; il n'est donc pas permis de les tuer.

Sans doute, le sujet ordinaire, celui qui n'est pas admis dans les conseils du Prince et de l'Etat n'est pas tenu d'étudier les causes de la guerre. Il lui est permis de combattre en faisant crédit à son supérieur. Il n'en est pas de même de ceux qui participent à un titre quelconque à l'exercice de la puissance souveraine, comme les députés par exemple—ou de ceux qui comme les journalistes sont appelés à diriger l'opinion.

Il est rare, il est vrai, que l'injustice d'une guerre soit évidente au point d'autoriser une démarche aussi grave que le refus de combattre. Pourtant dans la guerre actuelle nous en avons un exemple mémorable : la violation de la neutralité belge, dont l'injustice était reconnue par le chancelier lui-même. Très grave et presque aussi signatif était le refus opposé par l'Autriche à la demande d'arbitrage offerte par la Serbie. La guerre

* Victoria : *De jure belli*.

La Philosophie Scolastique

n'est permise que si elle est nécessaire et quand on a épuisé tous les moyens de conciliation.

Celui qui a guerre injuste entame la lutte sans titre juridique et le succès de ses armes ne lui en crée aucun. La guerre finie, eut-il envahi les territoires ennemis, il lui faudra restituer tout ce qu'il a détenu injustement et compenser son adversaire de toutes les pertes éprouvées. Le Prince coupable est en outre comptable vis-à-vis de ses propres sujets des dommages essuyés par sa faute.

Celui qui entreprend injustement une guerre est tenu de tous les dommages, que lui et les siens ont occasionnés à leur adversaire et à ses hommes ; il est également tenu de tous les dommages causés à ses propres sujets par l'adversaire, si celui-ci, à son tour, l'attaque justement.*

Il est temps de conclure. Je n'ai fait cependant qu'esquisser le sujet. Pour en faire saisir toute l'importance et la portée, il faudrait pousser plus à fond l'analyse. Ce que j'en ai dit suffit pour montrer l'originalité et l'intérêt de cette doctrine. Elle est en opposition directe avec toutes les théories qui considèrent la guerre comme un élément normal dans la vie des peuples. Parmi ceux qui soutiennent cette opinion les uns voient dans la guerre un moyen légitime d'affaiblir l'adversaire de manière à retirer de la lutte tous les avantages possibles. C'est une application brutale de la loi de lutte pour la vie. D'autres sont allés plus loin. Ils ont prétendu magnifier la guerre, en la présentant comme la plus noble et la plus haute des activités d'un peuple.

Sans doute la guerre est l'occasion de dévouements magnifiques. Elle éveille dans les âmes d'élites et même dans les âmes ordinaires les héroïsmes latents que la vie pacifique tenait endormis. Elle bouleverse l'échelle des valeurs, refoulant au dernier plan les biens matériels : les commodités, les richesses, les vanités auxquelles nos cœurs adhèrent trop servilement dans la douceur amollissante de la paix. On peut en dire autant des cataclysmes naturels : les incendies, les tremblements de

* Raymond de Pennafort : *Summ. Lib. II., T. V., XII., qu. V.*

et la Guerre

terre, les famines, et les épidémies. Personne pourtant ne songerait à les susciter : Dieu nous permet, de le prier d'écarter de nous toutes ces misères : *a peste, fame et bello libera nos Domine.*

D'ailleurs il y a un revers de la médaille. La guerre éveille la bête humaine que la civilisation s'efforce d'enchaîner. Les atrocités commises en Belgique par la soldatesque allemande dépassent tout ce qu'on peut imaginer. Quand les Allemands de bonne foi, les connaîtront d'après des documents complets et authentiques, ils frémiront d'horreur. Dans la théorie scolastique la guerre n'apparaît ni comme un bien, ni comme un mal absolu. Elle n'est un bien relatif que dans la mesure où elle s'ordonne en vue d'un bien supérieur : la paix dans la justice et la sécurité. Et ce qui est très remarquable c'est qu'elle offre une base philosophique à tous les efforts qui se sont produits depuis un siècle d'une manière un peu incohérente et fort mêlée en vue d'organiser juridiquement la société européenne. La guerre n'est juste que si elle est nécessaire. De la l'obligation morale de recourir à tous les moyens de conciliation et de règlements pacifiques qui dès aujourd'hui se présentent avec un fonctionnement aisé et de suffisantes garanties. Si ces moyens ne paraissent pas s'adapter assez complètement à tous les besoins d'une vie internationale pacifique, il y a pour tous les peuples chrétiens une obligation morale de s'entendre pour les amender et les compléter.

Et voyez combien cette théorie de la guerre, si elle était connue et surtout acceptée, rendrait en pratique des services éminents. Aujourd'hui, la conscience populaire, dans les pays de civilisation occidentale, répugne à toute guerre injuste. Nous en avons eu la preuve dans le conflit actuel. Les deux partis belligérants ont fait des efforts inouïs pour convaincre leurs nationaux et les neutres de la justice de leur cause. C'est qu'il serait aujourd'hui impossible de décider une nation civilisée, surtout dans les pays démocratiques, à une guerre qu'elle saurait injuste.

La Philosophie Scolastique

Mais comment juger de la justice ou de l'injustice d'une guerre moderne ? Les causes lointaines d'un conflit sont nombreuses, complexes et enchevêtrées. Il faudrait connaître l'histoire, étudier avec un sens critique très aiguisé des documents diplomatiques arrangés par chaque Etat selon les besoins de sa cause, fragmentaires, contradictoires, partialement commentés par une presse officieuse, et des hommes d'Etat sans conscience. Comment veut-on que le public s'y retrouve à un moment où les passions nationales sont poussées au paroxysme ? La théorie scolastique me paraît fournir un critère aisé et infaillible à la portée de tout homme. L'Etat qui refuse d'user de tous les moyens pacifiques de résoudre un conflit avant de déclarer la guerre, ou celui qui ayant soumis sa cause à l'arbitrage refuse d'accepter la sentence des arbitres, cet Etat a guerre injuste.

Mais si la théorie scolastique fournit une justification philosophique aux efforts qui ont pour objet l'établissement du société pacifique des nations, elle ne verse pas dans les utopies dangereuses et malsaines que professent certains pacifistes. Elle fonde la paix sur la justice. Résister à l'injustice par la force, c'est un droit et un devoir sacré. Non seulement la guerre défensive est légitime, mais la guerre offensive, malgré les aléas, les ruines, les sacrifices qu'elle peut entraîner, est un devoir quand il s'agit de défendre une cause juste. La fin et le bien commun du genre humain, dit Victoria,*

postule la guerre. Le monde ne pourrait vivre heureux, que dis-je, il serait réduit à la pire des conditions, si tous les tyrans, les voleurs et les brigands pouvaient impunément commettre leurs méfaits et opprimer les gens de bien et les innocents, sans que ceux-ci puissent de leur côté sévir contre les coupables.

L'Eglise n'aime pas la guerre, mais elle est forcée d'en constater l'existence et elle est amenée à en chercher une explication philosophique. Si elle tolère la guerre, elle n'autorise que la guerre juste et ses philosophes ont défini les conditions de la guerre juste. Forcée de

* *De jure belli.*

et la Guerre

tolérer la guerre qu'elle abhorre, elle a organisé contre elle à travers l'histoire toute une série d'obstacles plus ou moins efficaces. La Paix et la Trêve de Dieu sont peut-être les plus connus, la Chevalerie est le plus beau.

La Chevalerie c'est la forme chrétienne de la condition militaire, le chevalier c'est le soldat du Christ.

Au Xe siècle le chevalier germain est un véritable sauvage. On ne peut rien imaginer de plus barbare et de plus brutal.

À ce sauvage, l'Eglise enseigne, non seulement les commandements généraux, mais encore les commandements spéciaux du chevalier. Tu auras le respect de toutes les faiblesses et t'en constitueras le défenseur. La plus grande faiblesse en ces temps de barbarie, de violences et de meurtres, c'est l'Eglise :

Tu protégeras l'Eglise.

Tu aimeras le pays où tu es né.

Tu ne reculeras pas devant l'ennemi.

Tu ne mentiras pas et tu seras fidèle à la parole donnée.

Tu seras libéral et tu feras largesse à tous.

Tu seras partout et toujours le champion du droit et de la justice contre l'injustice et le mal.

Quand l'évêque, au jour solennel de l'adoubement religieux remettait au chevalier son épée :

Prends cette épée, lui disait-il, exerce avec elle la vigueur de la justice ; abats avec elle, la puissance de l'injustice . . . ce qui est par terre, relève-le. Ce que tu as relevé, conserve-le. Ce qui est injuste ici bas, abats-le. Ce qui est suivant l'ordre, fortifie-le. C'est ainsi que, glorieux et fier du seul triomphe des vertus, tu parviendras au Royaume de la Haut, où, avec le Christ dont tu portes le type, tu règneras éternellement.

J'espère avoir montré à nos lecteurs les trésors de sagesse et de lumière qu'on peut tirer de la philosophie scolastique, pour éclairer les problèmes politiques contemporains. *Nova et vetera*.* Comment se fait-il que ces enseignements précieux restent ignorés, et, en grande

* C'est la devise de l'Institut supérieur de philosophie de l'Université de Louvain.

La Philosophie Scolastique

partie inutilisés même dans les milieux catholiques ? La réponse est bien simple. Depuis la Renaissance, la philosophie scolastique a cessé de se développer. Pendant des siècles elle a vécu d'une vie précaire et diminuée à l'ombre des cloîtres et des couvents, refoulée par la végétation abondante et variée des systèmes de la philosophie moderne. Ce n'est que depuis quelques années, grâce à l'initiative hardie de Léon XIII., qu'elle a recommencé à être enseignée. Il a d'abord fallu la retrouver dans la poussière des in-folios, la reconstituer dans son architecture authentique ; ensuite il a fallu la confronter avec les questions que soulève la philosophie moderne ; avec les faits mis en lumière par une activité scientifique sans précédent ; avec les problèmes d'une vie économique et politique qui n'a pas d'analogue dans l'histoire. Ce double travail est loin d'être achevé.

Tous les Catholiques savent qu'un des centres les plus importants de cette rénovation scolastique se trouve à Louvain, dans l'Institut de philosophie fondé par le Cardinal Mercier et dirigé par lui pendant vingt ans. Avant la guerre l'œuvre vivait prospère et bienfaisante sous l'habile direction de Monseigneur Deploige, son distingué successeur. Mais, même avant la guerre, elle était loin d'être complète, faute de ressources financières. C'est là, c'est à Louvain, sous la haute direction du Cardinal Mercier, dont tous les Catholiques sont si légitimement fiers, que devrait se constituer une école de droit public chrétien, vouée à l'étude des problèmes internationaux, à la lumière de la philosophie scolastique et de la morale chrétienne. Puisse la Providence susciter les hommes capables de fonder cette école et leur donner les moyens de la faire vivre.

FERNAND DESCHAMPS.

ANTHOLOGIA LAUREATA

The Spirit of Man : an Anthology in English and French from the
Philosophers and Poets. Longmans, 5s. net.

THE Poet Laureate's Anthology was bound, we foreknew, to be an anthology with a difference. And we will have speculated on the quality of that personal note by which Mr. Bridges would doubtless differentiate it. He would have preferences, not necessarily shared ; and he might have purpose by no means just literary. But the customary anthology any well-read man of discernment can compile. He will wish to offer what is most representative of, or perhaps most beautiful in, the work of a person, or of an epoch ; even, of a people. But then, his personal taste must be severely in control. Not just what he likes must guide him. He might loathe, say, the Alexandrian school, and yet compose a genuinely illuminative anthology from its best, or its average, productions. Nor must motives of apostolate, so to say, govern his choice. His purpose must be obedience. A sound monarchist might yet put together, loyally, the best poems of the socialists, each poem brim full of an intent, in his eyes, disastrous. And a classical scholar might be just to the decadents ; or a Catholic, to Calvin. All that is needed is information, discernment, and sincerity.

But Mr. Bridges has a field too vast for sheer reading to exhaust it—it is the whole area of humanity. Learning must in him be supplemented by introspection ; and he must be able to trust that his own soul may justly claim to be in harmony with the universal mind—rich, therefore, in itself, and singularly wide in its embrace. Moreover, if in the world anything of purpose is contained, an expression of that world's spirit must, even to be representatively true, aim at more than mere representation, and itself be purposeful, overshoot its mark,

Anthologia Laureata

and strain after what has not yet been anywhere accomplished or fully verified.

Reduced to its simplest, Mr. Bridges's belief is that mankind reveals itself to be, and strives ever more perfectly to be, spiritual. His purpose, then, is to display this spirituality, and, thereby, to spiritualise. His method is the creation of a mood. He will evoke a circumambient atmosphere in which we shall find ourselves responsive. He invites us to "bathe" in these waters of his, not just to "fish" there. So, then, the pages are not numbered; nor any author named, save in the distant notes. As for these notes, they are often *apologia*; they will explain why he has preferred this or that style, or spelling, even; why he has been bold to alter translation or punctuation. True, they have often many historical, or scholarly, or even just personal touches; but in all they show clearly how it is the magic of a mood he aims at, not the offering of an argument: he means to weave a spell; he is not for unravelling a mystery. (And, indeed, can that be poetry, which can be frankly "understood"? Even, is that which we quite "understand" ever of much interest, or value?) At dawn and sunset, a light is on heaven and earth which persuades us that they live, and have a secret, and almost, that in a moment they will reveal it. But the radiance fades, and they become blind and dumb; or increases, and they grow platitudinous. The poet seeks to light up for us some such spiritual light; if, in it, we "see light," he will have had his hope.

Docile, then, to the mood engendered in us, we are to realise that the Ultimate is Spiritual; indeed, that this is not so much the "apex or final attainment" of human life, but its "basis and foundation." Man's proper work is "to interpret the world according to his higher nature," and to conquer its material aspects and subject them to his spirit. Perhaps we regret the metaphor a little. We do not want spirit to "underlie" more than that it should "crown." It must transfuse and alchemise. A cathedral has its "spirit," yet

Anthologia Laureata

not in its foundations more, or less, than in its weather-vanes. The spirit of St. Paul's is not, we may feel, in its crowning cross; while that of the Wesleyan Central Hall at Westminster is, altogether, in the cabbage or marigold or whatever be the ornament that tops it. But Mr. Bridges's meaning is clear. Spirit is innermost in man and starts the process and gradually, working through and outwards, "realises" him, reconstrues, nay, *reconstructs*, his universe.

Imagine an Ignatius or a John of the Cross, with their dogmatic beliefs volatilised save their doctrine of the soul and its progressions Godward. Thus Mr. Bridges guides. Spinoza teaches, first, just discontent: then, the Belle Dame Sans Merci of sadness has the heart in thrall: Prospero shows a world dream-like and to be dissolved: Thyrsis reminds us how the poet Clough, "too quick despairer," could not even wait for that, but died; and the Jesuit poet, Gerard Hopkins, who died thus too, is, astonishingly, more pessimistic over "the blight man was born for" even than Rimbaud, who, although the "soif malsaine" was dark in his blood, could yet hope for that future where once more "les cœurs s'éprennent." Job (Renan's pathetic version), Shakespeare's Henry VI. at Wakefield, Carlyle, the Ecclesiast, the *Phaedo*, sing, in shifting keys, the dirge of satisfaction. The soul, with the would-be hermit Pope, Gregory called *The Great*, goes into retreat; then, across its sober autumn mists a second spring shoots fitful beams. Is then a Heaven possible, after all? And, near Monica with Augustine, the soul exults into an ecstasy. False dawn, if you will. Intellect must first be disciplined. Aristotle braces it with metaphysic; then, through Plato, *Wisdom*, and St. John, the gentler vision returns. God has spoken; He has shone. The darkness "overpowered not" the Light; it is shining. Yet:

O how may I ever express that secret word?

O how can I say, He is unlike this, He is like that?

If I should say, He is within me, the universe were shamed.

Anthologia Laureata

If I say, He is without me, it is false.

He maketh the inner and the outer worlds to be indivisibly one.
The conscious and the unconscious, both are his footstools.

He is neither manifest nor hidden :

He is neither revealed nor unrevealed :

There are no words to tell what He is.

Thus, to the Indian weaver-mystic, Kabir, as, at first, to any Areopagite or Carmelite, in the Dark Night of Transcendence, "none appeared." On its side, Psalm 139 superbly hymns His Immanence ; Shelley, His Power ; the Sufi poet Jellaludin proclaims Him the unattainable centre of all desire.

Grasp the Skirt of His Grace, for on a sudden He will flee away :
But draw Him not impatiently to thee, lest He fly as an arrow from the bow.

What shape will He not assume ? What shifts He employeth !
If He be apprehended in Form, He will flee by way of the Spirit :
If thou seek Him in the sky, He will gleam in the water like the moon.

If thou seek Him in the spaceless, He beckoneth to Space :
When thou seekest Him in space, He fleeth to the spaceless.
His Name will flee, the while thou mouldest thy lips for speech :
Thou may'st not even say, Such an one will flee :
He will flee from thee, so that if thou paint His picture,
The picture will flee from the tablet, and His features from thy soul.

Thus, the religion of the Disincarnate. Yet even here faith bridges the gulf ; worship follows. Even Jellaludin's most secret God yields to persistence, and admits the soul whose comrade had so long been "the thought of Thee, O King."

O ask ye no more of me. Were I to tell you more words of His, Ye would burst your bonds : no roof nor door could restrain you.

Epictetus, Augustine, and King David conclude, in a great choir of praise, the first book of this anthology.

Three other books follow, impossible here to analyse. In the second, the fire-winged soul skims closer to the earth : art and the muses ; childhood, spring and love ;

Anthologia Laureata

nature ; romance, even, and fairyland ; but all this she sees in the spiritual light ; and in it, too, old age, mortality ; even sin, and life's necessary codes ; and the systems for the mind which shall guide wanton thought ; and in none of this can the pain, the *negative*, triumph ; through the virtues, the spirit passes forth into the life of Christian charity ; and that Name, without which all literature became insipid to Augustine, is, from these pages, not altogether absent. And, lest such high aspiration should, all over again, divorce the soul too utterly from earth, she learns of her vocation, her social call, human activity.

Even there, heroism may be asked ; there especially, just now ! For, says the compiler, the merit of his pages is in this not least, that they hold the work of one mind at one time. That time was the year 1915, when the consequences of "the apostasy of a great people," that is, the arresting of "the progress of mankind on the path of liberty and humanity," were being more adequately gauged. No more appalling indictment of Prussianism than Mr. Bridges's brief preface has, we well believe, been written ; no more splendid panegyric and prophecy than its conclusion. So from these pages the name of Rupert Brooke, for instance, is not absent ; and because a poet is a dreamer, not therefore are his eyes blind to the most modern and most actual. "A dream cometh through the multitude of business" : and lo, it is no dream, and no ghost, but the eternal and unconquerable spirit.

Is it part of our duty, as Catholics, to estimate the religious value of the Poet Laureate's book ? Not, most certainly, in the sense that we are to condemn, in gross and detail, all that does not match exactly with our beliefs. Everything, for example, that transcends materialism, that makes for discipline while preaching freedom, that inculcates repentance, must be praised. Still, are we quite wrong if we confess to an impression, left upon us after "bathing" in these streams, that somehow they have carried down with them, not wholly

Anthologia Laureata

dissolved and purged away, germs of the malady proper to a century for ever done with? Certainly what men now ask is the affirmative, even the dogmatic, the synthetic. They look with distrust, almost with bitterness, upon the vaporous and volatilised, all the cloud-castles with which men tried to replace the towers and battlements from which they had withdrawn the foundations. And the anthology does somehow seem to leave us with hopes high but vague; views iridescent and without any contour; resolve so gigantic as to outstrip all likelihood of its translation into act.

It is true that in the Preface an almost Puritan note is struck:

Common diversions divert us no longer: our habits and thoughts are searched by the glare of the conviction that man's life is not the ease that a pleasure-loving generation has found it or thought to make it, but the awful conflict with evil which philosophers and saints have depicted; and it is in their abundant testimony to the good and beautiful that we find support for our faith, and distraction from a grief that is intolerable constantly to face, nay impossible to face without that trust in God which makes all things possible.

We may see that our national follies and sins have deserved punishment . . . we can ever be grateful for the discipline: but beyond this it is offered to us to take joy in the thought that our country is called of God to stand for the truth of man's hope, and that it has not shrunk from the call.

Yes, but somehow these harmonies, simple-toned and massive like those, say, of Handel, are in the book itself *nuancées*, reduced, plunged "*dans une brume doucement sonore*," as Debussy loves to warn you his *Cathédrale* must be played. St. Paul appears, I think, but once: Amiel, Yeats, Montaigne, how often! And even so, this poor Apostle is made to cry aloud (save in the last line, which, set against preceding paragraphs, cannot counter-balance them for all its final Name) in that despair because of sin, over which his life and writings are really the authentic and typical triumph. St. Paul is not a model for lament, but for exultation in Him through

Anthologia Laureata

whom he "more than conquered." St. Matthew, too, comes once, quoted for the "incomparable vision or myth" of the "*In as much*." But St. Matthew cared little for "myths" or even parables, except in their organic connection with the Life. After all, the whole soul is smitten out of this "vision" if you cannot affirm, absolutely, the personality of Him who dares to assert that it is for His sake that these good actions of feeding the hungry and clothing the naked have their value. And St. John, too, is quoted once, but that in the relatively obscure phrases—in which the very translation is doubtful: we feel far from sure that Mr. Bridges has the right one—that open his Gospel. Yet these phrases hurry on to that for which alone the author wrote them—the tremendous dogma, *Verbum Caro Factum Est*; and that is here omitted.

Frankly, Christianity is "different." It is quite other than these Indian mystics and Persian poets; and the "saints" have very little indeed to do with the "philosophers." Altogether neither Christianity nor what men really wanted even before the war, and want still more since it is being waged, has any vital connection with that sapping subjectivism which, when all is said and done, contributes an element of poison (to our feeling) to a book which should have been all health and wholesomeness. At its strongest, this subjectivism becomes Mr. William James's creative will. "I do not see why the very existence of an invisible world may not in part depend on the personal response which any one of us may make to the religious appeal. God himself, in short, may draw vital strength and increase of very being from our fidelity." At its weakest, this humanism implies that it may be a good thing to act as though what we would like to believe were true. In all of it there is latent assumption that *the Spirit* is man's spirit; and the pendulum swings anxiously between naturalism and pantheism with the flux and reflux of temperament and fashion.

C. C. MARTINDALE.

THE RELIGIOUS IDEAL OF THE SLAVOPHILS

AN internal struggle between two opposite religious conceptions, between two divergent frames of mind, and, so to say, a sharp antagonism between two opposite geographical alignments dominate the history of Russian theological thought in the nineteenth century. With Asia following her victories or her defeats on one side, and Europe on the other ; with the spirit of her autocratic rulers sometimes progressive and at other times fiercely reactionary, through the course of her national history Russia appears, in one aspect, as a huge empire groping in a mournful Asiatic stagnation of thought and intellectual life, in another as hurried along by the currents of European life, eager to revive her slumbering energies at the flame and light of new ideals and to follow the leading of Western civilisation. In the literary and religious history of Russia these two opposite trends of thought are designated by the epithet of *Zapadnicestvo*, a term which we may render into English by the newly coined word Occidentalism, and by that of Slavophilism.

The literary contests between the followers of either tendency have been waged especially in the religious field. Modern Russia is a hieratic empire resting on a strongly religious basis. She bears the appearance of a vast theocracy, which has been wrongly represented as the result of many centuries of political bondage and of spiritual sluggishness. The great strength, the indomitable force of Russia, inert it may be granted, but essentially a living force, is the Church, which is also the asylum of the Russian soul, the centre of its yearnings, the synthesis of its aspirations, the majestic throne of its glory, the altar of its prayer. A renewal of Russia, therefore, would necessarily mean a renewal of the Russian Church. A new alignment to be given to the Russian people would imply the influx of a new element of life and action into the rigid traditionalism of Russian

The Religious Ideal

Orthodoxy, the transfusion of youthful blood into the frozen veins of Russian ecclesiastical bureaucracy. The followers of Occidentalism went too far in pressing their claims. Some of them would have liked a Voltairian Russia, a Russia stripped of her religious legacy and clothed with a garb of foreign thought. It is, therefore, no wonder that they lost their hold upon Russian hearts, and that they exercised but little influence upon the spiritual development of the Russian mind. They did not perceive that the patriotic chord vibrates sonorously in the hearts of the people, and that words which disparage the historic past of a vigorous nation either awaken strong reaction or at best fail to direct new tides of life into the channels of the popular conscience.

Slavophilism, on the contrary, as is plainly evident by its very name, centred around the national consciousness of Russia, and re-echoed in the Slav world as the warlike anthem of a patriotism strung to the highest pitch of exaltation. The Slavophil movement took its rise from the remotest recesses of the Slav soul, from the deepest channels of the Slav conscience. In its systematic scheme it gathered up in one melodious synthesis all those voices, sometimes passionate, sometimes rebellious, all those dreams of pride and conquest, all those yearnings after revenge, all those thrills of glory which together make up religious and political Russia, both autocratic and orthodox. Slavophilism grew as the spontaneous building up of a national philosophy, a fortunate attempt towards the working out of a Russian mentality, an optimistic analysis of the Russia of the past, a radiant vision of the Russia of the future. Slavophilism is built upon love: a perennial, tender, enthusiastic love of the Slav soul, as it comes to us through the course of the ages in the striking features of its childhood; in the candid simplicity of those clustered within the precincts of its monasteries; in the somewhat superstitious but ever youthful ingenuousness of its religious life; in its firm, unshakable adhesion to the creed and standards of Orthodoxy; in its moral and intellectual shrinking from

The Religious Ideal

Western ideals. To gain the mastery over Russian hearts, the Slavophiles painted in vivid colours the majestic lines of the structure of political Russia, and the mysterious charm of her religious feeling. They sought out the secret springs of Russian greatness in the religious, political and social institutions of the Russia of the past; they closed their eyes voluntarily upon the glittering splendours of the Western genius; they laid a great stress upon the preservation of Russian native characteristics; they magnified the insulation of the Russian people, and put forward its slow but autonomous development as the mighty beginning of everlasting victories, of spiritual conquests, of moral supremacy, of a world hegemony. Seen through the prism of Slavophile mysticism, the White Tzar became a knight of God, destined to rule not only the Russians who still cling faithfully to the aims of Christian regeneration, but also the Western nations who now seem to be slipping back into the yawning abyss of religious doubt. So to speak, they trod the stage of Russia as the lyrical minstrels of Orthodoxy, and in Orthodox Christianity they sought the origins of the historical grandeur of Russia, and the promise of its future mission towards Christianity and mankind.

A prominent writer of the Slavophile phalanx, Koscelev, used to say that "Orthodoxy is the spice which gives relish to Russian nationality." The distinguishing mark of Russia, according to Ivan Kirevsky, consists in the fulness and purity of its religious conception; such a fulness is, in turn, the exclusive possession of Orthodox Christianity, which in Russia permeates all the phases and all the forms of life, both social and individual. Hence it follows that Slavophilism is the corner-stone of the huge edifice of the Russian Empire, the beacon-flame guiding us through the maze of its past, and a brilliant commentary on the Russian soul of the present day. Such a commentary, says Berdiaev, has been put in a proper light by the Slavophiles, to whom we are indebted for the first original sketch of Slav ideology. It was the

of the Slavophiles

Slavophiles who defined and pictured Russian thought as a thought prominently religious, sending forth soaring aspirations towards God. It was the Slavophiles who drew in strong relief the eternal truth of Eastern Christianity and the finished structure of the Russian nationality and the organic synthesis of them both. In their eyes the Russian nation appears as the embodiment of Christian truth, which is looked upon as a real and exclusive gift and glory of Eastern Orthodoxy. In their writings they magnified Orthodox Christianity as the energetic principle of a new type of civilisation, as the inexhaustible fountain of a new religious experience, as the lever of a most intense spiritual life, as a rampart against the onslaught of "Roman" Catholicism. And it was precisely because they thus harmoniously joined Eastern Orthodoxy with Russian nationalism, treating them as two vigorous roots supplying their vital sap to the same gigantic trunk, that the Slavophiles exercised so powerful and enduring a sway over the national conscience of the Russian people, and were able to shape the historic frame of Orthodoxy as they willed. We do not exaggerate, then, when we say that the Slavophiles were the first original theologians of Russia, Orthodox thinkers who rose above the level of the tame mediocrity of the official theology, and by the greatness of their conception, the depth of their religious experience, and the breadth of their synthesis overpowered the opposition of the ecclesiastical Academies of Petrograd and Moscow. "They were," says Herscenson, "the channels which gathered up the limpid waters of the conceptions, both religious and national, which for long centuries had brimmed the reservoir of the Russian sub-soil." Notwithstanding their animosity against the Western culture, they tinged their teaching with a shade of universalism, and in the heart of the Russian people they searched for the eternal truth of Christ, for the Jerusalem of the living God. Under their lead, and amidst the dazzling imagery of their poetic fancy, they put forward to the Russian conscience the ideal of a humanity purified by Christ

The Religious Ideal

from the filth of sin; they emphasised Russia as the majestic tree spreading out its roots throughout the whole world, and calling all peoples under the shelter of its mystic and spiritual shade.

Who inaugurated this Slavophil movement of thought? Who laid down the sturdy foundations of a system which mirrors the secret yearnings of the Russian soul in every department of learning as well as in social and political life? The historians of Russian literature dignify Ivan Kirevsky with the name of the intellectual Patriarch of Slavophilism, and the writings of this genial thinker indeed set forth its main tenets, even in the field of religious idealities. To Berdiaev, the forerunner of Slavophil tendencies is Puskin, the national bard of Russia, the fountain-head of the Russian genius in the flowery gardens of the Muses. It is quite true that it was the songs of Puskin that awakened the Slav national conscience, and it is the philosophical reflex of this awakening that is formulated by Slavophilism. Through the sparkling prism of Puskin's poetry Russia is seen buckling on the armour of its epic warriors and drawing the sword of justice, or else she appears before us like a majestic river which gathers up in one broad stream the limpid waters of all the brooks of Slavdom, fecundating the germs of life with its fertilising moisture. By reading and musing upon these winged poems, Slavophiles dreamed of a Russia that opens an untrodden field of speculation—a Russia destined to bring new life into the veins and heart of Western Christianity, at present nipped in the bud of its spiritual life, to enroll under its banners the scattered members of the Slav races, and then to advance towards the moral conquest of mankind. Such an idealised Russia as this, tragically heroic in its virtues and in its vices, fascinating alike in its beauty and in its ugliness, perpetually mystic both in its prayers and in its blasphemies, arises through the poetic genius of Puskin in vivid colours and magic tints within the spirits of Slavophiles, and there assumes the decided contours of an ideological reality.

of the Slavophiles

Such are the origins of Slavophilism as viewed by its own adherents ; but to our thinking, Slavophilism, understood as the confused outgrowth of a political and religious system, as a simmering coalescence of indefinite aspirations, as an instinctive ascent towards high ideals, must be traced back to an epoch prior even to that of Puskin and Kirevsky. It radiated its earliest morning gleams at the very moment when the tragic fate of Byzantium was about to be accomplished. In 1453, the bulwark of Orthodoxy crumbled away at the shock of Islamic hordes, and the chief basilica of the Christian East, bereft of its Christian glory, underwent the supreme dishonour of being changed into a meeting place of infidels. Yet the religious tradition originating from Byzantium did not merely sink into mournful oblivion. The legacy of Byzantium, both religious and political, was to be inherited by a Power able to perpetuate Byzantine imperialism by the vitalising influence of its faith as well as by the gallantry of its mighty armies. And the greatest of all Orthodox peoples, the Russians, felt vaguely that by a kind of an historic right the religious and political inheritance of Byzantium fell to the share of their Tzars, of their Church, of their metropolis. To the Russian consciousness Moscow took the place of the dying Byzantium, and claimed for itself the title of the third Rome, which should blend the glory of the sacred Western Empire in harmony with that of the unsullied Eastern Church. The marriage of the Tzar Ivan III. (1440-1505) with the Byzantine princess, Sophia Palaeologa, invigorated and enhanced these secret yearnings of the Russian consciousness, and even in the seventeenth century a famous missionary of Croatia, Sergius Krijanitch, a Catholic priest, championed the political and religious unification of the Slavs under the shelter of Russia—a unification which, had it ever been realised, might have inaugurated a new era in the life of both Christendom and mankind.

By the ceaseless labours and the brilliant talents of the Slavophiles, this medley of religious ideas and of patriotic claims, this amorphous chaos of aspirations, grew into

The Religious Ideal

organic shape, the shape of a massive edifice whose architectural lines are vigorously accentuated; of an edifice which, in the minutest details of its architecture, in the slim shafts of its columns, in the finely chiselled foliage of its capitals, in the massive structure of its pillars, in the coruscating radiance of its golden cupolas bears no foreign stamp, no single imprint of a foreign art. The style of the Slavophil edifice is a purely Russian one. The air within it comes down from a Russian sky, the stones cemented in its walls are rent from Russian rocks, its halls are the silent sanctuary of the Russian soul which there lifts itself up to God on the wings of prayer. And none but the Russian soul is able of itself to delve into the fascinating mystery, to understand the full charm of these Russian conceptions of the Slavophiles and withal to feel instinctively that these may be one day realised in fact.

In its organic form, Slavophilism, the most fragrant and beautiful flower of the Russian soil, is the joint masterpiece of a great host of skilful artists, each of whom has impressed upon it the peculiar stamp of his own scientific tendency. As has been justly remarked by Dr. Paul Vinogradov, each single leader of the Slavophil phalanx has presented with exceptional force one side or another of the wide subject; to Ivan Kirevsky belongs the credit of establishing the general philosophical basis, Peter Kirevsky and Constantine Aksakov have worked out the conception of Russian history, Youri Samarine may be regarded as the political champion of the party in home affairs, Dm. Valuief and Ivan Aksakov as its exponents in regard to international relations. But Khomiakov above them all is hailed as the systematiser and unifier of the religious beliefs and holy dreams of Slavophil philosophy. A well-known Slavophil writer, a whole-hearted disciple of Khomiakov, George Samarin, does not hesitate to call his master by the name of a Doctor of the Church—a lofty claim indeed. It becomes less strange, however, if we bear in mind the previous inertness of Russian theological thought, and

of the Slavophiles

compare it with the deep originality of Khomiakov's system. In any case we are certainly not exaggerating if we say with Berdiaev that Khomiakov deserves to be styled the chief theologian of Slavophilism.

Ancestral influences as well as his mother's teaching settled the lines on which his literary life and theological speculation were to run. He was born at Moscow, on the first of May, 1808 (old style). His blood was of the purest Muscovite nobility. His mother, a woman of unshaken faith and iron firmness of character, brought him up to the worship of both the Russian Church and the Russian country. Khomiakov's letters abound with praises of the woman who shaped his mind and heart. Strange to say, this warm defender of Orthodoxy, this theologian so intimately convinced of the truth of his faith, this spirit so deeply permeated with hostile feelings towards Catholicism, spent some years of his adolescence under the moral and literary tuition of a French priest, the Abbé Boivin. In his youth he craved for the glory of arms. In 1821 the Greeks had revolted against Turkish barbarism. The gaze of the civilised world was turned to the handful of Greek heroes who hoisted the labarum of Redemption against the Crescent. Giving way to the generous impulses of his heart, Khomiakov left his father's house and set off to join the legions of Philhellenes, who were shedding their blood for the double cause of Greece and of humanity. His plans having been discovered in time, he was brought back and forced to renounce them. In his *Epistle to Venevitinov*, which is the first poem he ever wrote, he describes in touching verses the impressions of his heroic prank:

Alas! the rosy-hued illusions of my fancy vanished away: golden dreams of adolescence, visions of glory, burning flames of desire ceased to haunt my youthful spirit. From the Northern seas, eternally frozen with glittering ice, I once looked to the high-towering billows of the Mediterranean, dear to the gods, and gazed at an earthly paradise, where the heavenly vault, the azure sky

The Religious Ideal

above the billows, the rocks, the forests, the fields breathe in joy and softness—where many peoples have bloomed and blossomed under the protection of law and within the walls of freedom's sanctuary. And I hoped to rove throughout these countries; I longed to rush into the thick of the fight to shed my blood for the rebirth of a race kindred to me. As a new Leonidas of regenerated Greece, I desired that my name should be graven upon the memory of mankind. I craved to dart the avenging thunderbolt like Perun, the Russian God. O charming dream, O dream filled with delight and mysterious glamour! Alas! it was but from the land of unrealities. Yet, if the Tzar's voice would call us to the tragic horrors of war; if he would bid us draw the sword of shining steel, a sword which emancipates throngs of slaves, and spreads terror, and revives the blooms of hope; if the Tzar incited us to avenge, this sword in hand, the Greeks agonising under the infidels' yoke; then truly, in the ranks of gallant warriors, as an avenger of Greece, as a champion of the honour and faith of my country, I fain would expose my life, throw on my breastplate and begin a new life with my soul budding as a flower!

It was not long, however, before he tasted in full delight what he calls "the glory of the bloody strife." When he was eighteen years old, he entered upon a military career, and in 1828 took part in the war of Russia against Turkey, distinguishing himself by his heroism. At the close of the war he came back to his literary studies, and in 1836 he married Catherine Mikailovna Jazykova, in whom he found his spiritual co-worker and the happiness of his life. An untimely death cut him down in the full-grown maturity of his genius. He died of cholera on September 23, 1860, and the last words of his agony bear witness to the sincerity of his Christian faith, to his unshakable certainty that the grave opens fresh sources of eternal life in realms illuminated with the light of God.

Rightly to understand in its entirety the theological system of Khomiakov it would be necessary to scan his soul, to explore his conceptions in the light of his psychological characteristics, a study which does not enter into the plan of my subject. As a faithful echo of the

of the Slavophiles

Byzantine tradition, Khomiakov is above all a controversialist, an intellectual wrestler who wields his pen like a sword. There is in his theological system an intimate link of connection between religion and patriotism. His attachment to the Russian native soil is the ingrained fibre of his Orthodox convictions. The Russian Church he loves as the natural expansion, as the spontaneous budding of the Russian soul, as the stronghold of the future destinies of his country. Hence it follows that for him to defend Russia would be to protect Orthodox Christianity; and the struggle against the foes of Orthodoxy, in his mind, is altogether a strife for the defence of Russia's political body. In the fibre of the Russian heart he feels the vibration of a celestial string, the soft melody of a divine voice, of a prophetic spirit, that announces to it a mission from above.

The theology of Khomiakov is the religious commentary on his Messianic expectations. No doubt his Messianism is not pictured with such decided strokes as is that of the Polish mystics of the nineteenth century, especially of Mickiewicz and Towianski, who venerate the Polish people as the reincarnation of Christ, and regard the political partition of Poland as a new crucifixion of the Messiah, and the Poles as a chosen tribe predestined to initiate in the world a new stage in the life of Christian thought. The Messianism of our Russian thinker is rather, if I am permitted to coin a phrase, a religious *missionism*, an intimate and deeply-rooted conviction that among all the nations the Russian people is alone invested with a mission to be carried on in the life of mankind. To Khomiakov, Russia has been charged to realise Christian social life in this world, to reveal Orthodoxy as a social organism. In the course of its history Byzantium failed to give to this idea a practical value—to make it palpable, so to say. The Russian people, imbued with the spirit of Christ and saturated with religion, aim at being on earth the Holy Russia, at building up a kingdom of saints, at

The Religious Ideal

cultivating on their own soil the fairest flower of Christian mysticism, at reaching the sunlit heights of inner perfection. Russians, says Khomiakov, are not fond of human glory, of a huge domination, of tremendous military power. The Russian ideal is an ideal of sanctity. Russia exists to bestow the gift of freedom upon those whose growth is hampered by fetters; to map out to mankind the ways of Christian truth; to cause the voices of Prophets to re-echo in human hearts; to fertilise the world with the warm rays of the Eastern sun. The task of Russia, a task which unfortunately has been hindered by the political rulers of the country, is to break the chains of slavery, to bestow upon all the peoples the life of thought and the peace of life. From the high places of the Russian soul there springs a fountain the jets of which are waves of fresh vitality. But to achieve its task Russia must purify herself in the waters of spiritual regeneration, she must weep for her crimes, which brand her brow with a stain of infamy. When once they have expiated their past, the Russian people will be able to wage war to set free the peoples who have been enslaved by the foes of the Christian name.

This conception of Russia inspired in Khomiakov a glowing poem on the occasion of the Crimean War :

Hearken, O Russia, to the appeals of God. Go forward to the holy war : God loves thee : God fills thy heart with mighty power. In thy bosom there lives an energy to withstand the shock of brutal force, of foes that are blind and savage. Wake, O country of my fathers : make haste to break the chains of thy brethren. From beyond the waves of the Danube I hear a voice calling for help. With soul prostrate before God, with brow humbled to the dust, raise to heaven thy timid prayer, and heal the wounds of thy guilty conscience with the sweet balm of tears. Then rush into the red flames of the murderous strife and fight for thy brethren. With a stout hand raise up the standard of God, and strike with thy sword. Thy sword is the vengeance of God.

This mission of Russia, as he conceived it, is a Christian

of the Slavophiles

and universal one, which will be realised within the pale of the Orthodox Church. Nationalistic aims led Khomiakov to a deepening conception of the Christian Church, and to the conviction that the Eastern ecclesiastical organisation is more excellent than that of Western Christianity. If Russia is to be looked upon as a nation hallowed with the rays of sanctity, the Russian Church, the historic embodiment of Russian religious life, must be the source of the Christian perfection of the Russian soul, and as such it deserves to be venerated as the true Church of Christ. It followed from this, in his conception, that the Churches separated from the Orthodox Church necessarily go astray, and alter and vitiate the divine teaching.

The Church is only One, says Khomiakov, but it is too difficult a task to define it. In its intimate being, the Church is a living body and as such enjoys freedom of motion and variety of action, so that it cannot be constrained within the narrow limits of a definition. The grievous wrong of the *official* Orthodox theology (by that epithet he denotes theology of Russian ecclesiastical academies and seminaries) consists in the application of the narrow methods and rationalistic tendencies of scholasticism to the conception of the Church. Even the most famous of the Russian theologians, Macarius Bulgakov, Metropolitan of Moscow, is styled by him a scholastic, a mean-spirited reasoner whose system of Orthodox theology depreciates Russian theological thought in the eyes of foreign critics. There is a lack of originality and vigorous conceptions in the writings of official Russian theologians. They waver between Catholicism and Protestantism, or are deeply embedded in the stagnant swamps of obsolete or obsolescent scholastic speculation, or ride with all sails set in the seas of rationalism. The official Orthodox theology, says Khomiakov, is entirely impregnated and moistened with scholasticism: hence it follows that it does not realise the genuine conceptions of Orthodoxy, nor express the religious experiences of Eastern Chris-

The Religious Ideal

tianity, or the vitality of Russian faith. In his opinion that school of theology fixes its gaze too exclusively at the outward side of the Christian teaching—at the sacramental system, at the visible rites. Its members take little heed of the inner life of the Church, of the hidden wells of mystic waters, in short, of the soul of the Church, which sheds light and warmth upon the religious experiences of its members.

In his own theological system Khomiakov lays far greater stress upon the moral side of the Christian teaching than upon the dogmatic. To him theological dogma is merely a dialectical exercise of cold-blooded minds, which imagines distinctions and devises theories about the divine processions, and the nature and personality of God. True Christian doctrine, he would say, is life, is running water, is burning flame, is a strong voice, even in its inaccessible mysteries; and the force that supports this life and is the cause of the rhythm of its motions, and the origin of all its power—this force is love. Love and freedom, these are the two cornerstones of the Church in Khomiakov's theology. Not only is the Church possessed of liberty, but it is liberty itself. Hence the theology of the true Church must also be free; a theology not enslaved to peculiar systems, not hemmed in by landmarks, not gagged by strict censorship, not frozen into dead formulas, not stripped of its wings: but a theology which makes its way into the inmost recesses of the heart, and sounds as the faithful echo of a soul that has learnt to see and to love its God. This freedom, however, which Khomiakov considers an essential element of the conception of the Church, is not to be thought of as individualised in every member of the body. Councils are in Christianity the organised form of ecclesiasticism. When he thus excluded individualism from the idea of the Church, Khomiakov was intimately convinced that he was not forsaking the doctrinal positions of Orthodoxy. According to him, religious individualism, either through excess or through defect, obscures the true notion of the

of the Slavophiles

Church in both Catholicism and Protestantism. A free Council is the true arbiter of Christian teaching. At the same time, Councils bridle the licentiousness of the critical spirit. The Church does not rest upon an "idolatrous worship of authority," nor on the turmoil of the perpetually varying conceptions of religious individualism. "Doubtless Christianity is ruled by law," he says, "but this is not the law of the slave or of the hireling. It is, on the contrary, the law of filial love grounded on liberty." This freedom we are bound to use in the field of religious researches. The apostles not only tolerated free inquiry, but laid it upon the Christian conscience as a fundamental duty. By means of free inquiry the Fathers of the Church sheltered and preserved the sacred inheritance of Christ's teaching. It might be said that free inquiry is in a sense the sole foundation of revealed truth. All religious belief, every kind of intellectual faith, presupposes a free act, a free consent of will, and springs from preliminary religious inquiry. Christianity is nothing less than freedom in Christ. "In my conception of the Church," says Khomiakov,

there is more freedom than in that of Protestantism, because the theologians of the Reformation claimed an infallible authority for Holy Writ, an authority outside of man, whilst the true Church finds in the inspired books a witness to itself, the assertion of an inward manifestation of its own life.

Hence he would affirm that the Church has no right to thrust religious unity upon her subjects by forcible means, or to claim a blind obedience to her prescriptions. A religious unity begotten of violence is a false one, and the so-called blind obedience is only spiritual death. The Church has no head on earth either clerical or lay. Christ alone is the head of the divine organism. The Church is not an authority, because authority implies the existence of something external to oneself to which one ought to submit. Truth alone is the source of the

The Religious Ideal

inner life of man. The Church knows the spirit of brotherhood but ignores the spirit of subjection. Her unity is the synthetic interweaving of freedom and love. In short, it may be characterised as the gathering up of individual liberties. The Church's history is specifically the history of human freedom which has been sanctified and enlightened by the Holy Spirit :

In Holy Writ we have not a dead letter, a religious-political monument of old, but the witness and the word of all the Church, or rather our own word, the word of the Church's members. The Sacred Scripture is a portion of our own being and, as such, it cannot be wrung from us. The story of the New Testament is the intimate story of our own self. By the waters of Jordan we share in the passion and death of Jesus : by the Eucharist we are joined to Christ : it was on our feet, tired with long wanderings, that Jesus poured water: and on the day of Pentecost it was on our heads that the Holy Spirit descended, so that our liberty thus consecrated by love might render greater glory to God than the moral bondage of ancient Israel.

It is plain that this idea of the Church worked out by Khomiakov looks like a mystical exaggeration or an idealisation of the Pauline conception, which represents the Church as an organism whose head is Christ and whose life, like a mighty tide, flows out from the inexhaustible riches of the Holy Spirit. A member though he was of a Church that reaches the climax of both ritualism and formalism, Khomiakov, notwithstanding the claims which he makes for Orthodoxy, does not discover the Church in its hierarchical organisation, nor in its official priesthood, nor even in its sacramental system, but rather in the individual conscience, in the very fibres of the Christian heart. The Church's life is to him freedom's life, and freedom and love form the nerves and veins of its body. If we penetrate the meaning of his theological system, the Church is not an institution, and neither "juridical formalism" nor "scholastic rationalism" enters into it as an element of its powerful vitality. The

of the Slavophiles

general Councils have the full authority of civil courts, but the value and weight of their decisions is subordinate to the free and loving consent of the Church's members to them.

While thus considering the Church as a body in which freedom and unity blend together and smooth their antinomies with the cohesive force of love, Khomiakov states with clearness and firmness the grounds of the differentiation between Church and State, and has mapped out for himself the path to a strong though biased criticism of the fundamental positions of Catholicism, Protestantism and Orthodoxy. Papal Rome is the special target of his religious antipathies. Under his pen, Roman Catholicism is the bold inheritor of the juridical spirit of ancient Rome, the reproduction on Christian soil of her political empire, the restoration of the dead Roman despotism. It cannot be denied, he says, that the Roman spirit is largely juridical. All the social and individual powers in Rome were in a state of bondage to the civil law, and they were moulded in compliance with the rules and principles of Roman lawyers. The development of juridical science increased the atrophy of the national conscience, whose voice was stifled by the force of legalised utilitarianism. Thus, enslaved by juridical formalism, the spirit of Rome was not able to understand the ideal of the Christian Church; it paid but little heed to the exclusively moral grounds of organised Christianity and misconceived the law of Christian love which is the vital principle of the social and organic unity of the Church. To the Roman State, religion appeared as an imperial law, and the Church as an earthly institution with social and civil bearings. No wonder then if these pagan conceptions filtered through into the mind and heart of Christian Rome. The lust of supremacy and the dream of world domination were the two legacies which come down to Roman Christianity from pagan Rome. In the eyes of Khomiakov, the Roman Church is only the *imperium romanum*, an empire utterly bereft alike of love and of freedom.

The Religious Ideal

This deviation of the Roman Church from its religious mission resulted next, he tells us, in the development of that theoretical rationalism which "infected" the scholastic thought of the Middle Ages, and gradually changed the Papacy from being the centre of religious life into a great political institution. Then, this same rationalism in its attempts to criticise ecclesiasticism gave rise to the rebellious movement of the Reformation, which, says Khomiakov, is a most severe punishment inflicted by God upon Western Christianity for the sins of the Papacy.

But Rome was not the only offender. According to Khomiakov, Protestantism went to the other extreme. It restored, indeed, individual freedom, which had been held in thralldom by the political egotism of the Roman Church, but it altogether broke down religious unity. The rationalistic principle had penetrated into the Roman Church. After the consummation of the schism, in Protestantism, later on, it grew into unrestrained religious individualism. The prerogatives granted to the Pope in the Roman Church were now ascribed to every Christian, and every Christian, so to say, became a Pope in miniature. So for the single Pope of the Roman Church there was substituted in Protestantism as many Popes as there were individual members.

As time went on, the rationalism of Western Christianity, following out the process of dissolution of Christian truth, gave up its religious shape and laid the foundations of the abstract and anti-Christian philosophy of German Kultur. German philosophy led Western Christianity to the breaking crest of the wave, to the orgies of the French Revolution and the worship of the Goddess Reason. Thus, in his view, the schism between the East and the West, by pushing Western Christianity into rationalism, obscured the moral character of the Church, increased Papal absolutism, shattered the bonds of love, built up the kingdom of violence, gave birth to rebellions within the pale of the Church, shed torrents of blood, dried up the fibres of Christian charity, sowed

of the Slavophiles

and watered the seed of irreligion, and, at length, de-throned God and thrust the Western peoples away from the fold of Christ.

Can there be, then, no perfect Christendom on earth ? The question is answered by Khomiakov in the affirmative. But, like God in the Hegelian philosophy, the perfect Christendom is not yet realised : it is in *werden*, an inchoate reality, which is to reach its final perfection in the coming ages. When compared with Rome, Byzantium typifies a higher form of Christianity, a form, however, which shapes itself in the field of theoretical doctrine while groping inert in that of practical life. We behold here the "mischievous" influence of Rome acting on the political organism of Byzantium, and enslaving it to the absolutism of the State. At Byzantium the purely intellectual forces of Christianity had been very active, dispelling the clouds of minds. On the contrary, the organising forces that should imbue the social life with Christian ideals had been kept at bay by the political absolutism. The dynamics of Christendom consequently stopped short, like the wheels of a machine that meets with an obstacle. It grew static : it stiffened into a rigidity like that of the Byzantine icons.

Nevertheless, the merits of Byzantium in the history of sound Christian tradition are, to the Slavophile, beyond all doubt. Gifted with a spirit of intellectual harmony, with an acute insight into the most abstruse questions of philosophy, a disciplined erudition, an individualistic trend free from juridical formalism, Greek thought explored the boundless tracts of religious speculation, poured forth torrents of light upon Christian tradition, fixed the boundaries of Christian truth, explained its inner meaning and hidden treasures, destroying error by brushing aside the dross of heresy, and this unsullied legacy it handed down to other peoples, to the Slav races which possessed the inner social strength necessary for the realisation of the perfect ideal of Christendom on earth. Greek thought perceived the sublime poetry and the beauty of the synthetic accord

The Religious Ideal

of freedom and unity in Christian love, but it did not translate it into action because of its subservience to the political despotism of the Byzantine Emperors. In Russia, however (the Russia of old here is alluded to), the social body reflected the earliest type of Christian organisation. From any such point of view, Russian Christianity, a Christianity identical with that of Byzantium as to the whole of its doctrinal teaching, surpasses it in the structure of its social edifice. To be sure, it is true that as yet Russian Christianity has not succeeded in realising the harmonious synthesis between theory and practice, in embodying the purity of its dogmatic beliefs in a social organism saturated with the Christian ideal, ruled by the law of love, rejuvenated by the vigorous life of freedom. Its failure, however, is due to the lack of cohesion and co-operation among the various elements of its social body. But the ceaseless, the never-failing aspiration of the Russian soul aims at the perfect embodiment of the Christian vital principle into a well-constituted Christian society: the victory of Christian love which brings together all peoples within the pale of the one Church without robbing them of the treasure dearest to each Christian soul, the possession of individual liberty.

Khomiakov is the most authoritative exponent of that school which in Russia continues the unreasonable worship of the Byzantine tradition. A breath of religious hatred passes over his writings whenever he deals with Western Christianity, and yet he cannot refrain from paying homage to the grandeur of the Latin genius and from extolling the Latin soil as the soil of wonders and masterpieces. Among Russians, the theories of Khomiakov met with sharp critics and keen opposition. Vladimir Soloviev vigorously asserted the great fundamental principle of Catholicism, that the unity of the Church must be obtained by the triumph of the Catholic principle of Rome. Trubeckoi and Berdiaev also threw full light upon the high merits of Western Christianity, and on the deep religious feelings which impregnate Latin

of the Slavophiles

religion, and inspire the epics of Mediæval Catholicism. And perhaps the awful strife of the day, a strife which gnaws the living energies of Russia far more than those of the other belligerent countries, the present war, I say, will result in drawing Russians nearer to the detested heretics of the West, and in solving the literary contest between Slavophilism and Occidentalism with the moral victory of the latter.

We have aimed at nothing more than a glance at the theological views of Alexis Khomiakov. No wonder then if we do not attempt to discuss from our point of view his gloomy criticism of Western Christianity. High-minded Russian thinkers, such as Soloviev, Trubeckoi, and Berdiaev had an easy task in showing that Khomiakov was in the dark as to all that concerns the living religious forces of the West, and the deep mystical feeling of the Latin races.

In a beautiful passage Nicholas Berdiaev points out the deficiencies of Khomiakov's sharp criticism of Western Christianity.

Khomiakov's conceptions and formulas are those of the whole Church. Every right-minded Christian must agree with them in the main. But there is an evident lack of impartiality in the working out of his system. His teaching about the Church is a polemical one; he carried on his defence of the Orthodox Church by vehement attacks on the Churches of the West. According to him, all the beautiful features and gifts of Christ's Church, freedom, love, organic structure, unity, all are gathered in the bosom of the Orthodox Church, while Roman Catholicism is stripped of them and shows but the stains of its deviations from truth, and the weaknesses of human malice. Khomiakov's main defect, his most grievous sin, is the lack of love towards the Christian West. In his writings he was always striving to picture the Russian Church as in no way disfigured by historical mistakes and human aberrations. In opposition to the impurity of the West, the Russian and Greek Churches preserve, in his eyes, their divine beauty, the dependence of the human element upon the divine. Thus, the chief error of Khomiakov and the Slavophiles lies in their wrong judgment of the Roman Church. No one wishes to disparage the great mystical value of Orthodoxy,

The Religious Ideal

which has inherited the teaching of Christ unaltered. But the mystic essence of the Church, unity in love and freedom, has not vanished from Catholicism. He ought to have remembered that, in the Catholic Church, the true Sacraments of Christ are conferred : that she has the uninterrupted apostolic succession, the holy traditions, the mystic communion between the living and the dead. He ought to have distinguished the Christian Catholic world from the excesses of its chiefs, and the faults of the hierarchy. The deviations of Roman Catholicism are merely relative, not absolute at all. Khomiakov made Rome solely accountable for the spread of rationalism, and this although he was not himself free of rationalistic tendencies. He did not know, did not appreciate, the Western mystics. He ceaselessly fixed his eyes in critical distrust upon official Catholic theology while he seems scarcely conscious of the mystic life of Catholicism, the mystic yearnings of Catholic saints, the religious experience of the humbler members of the Church.

It would, we are ready to admit, be quite unwise to bring in a verdict against Orthodoxy solely upon her official theology. To penetrate the spirit of Eastern Christianity we need to examine the intimate religious life of the Orthodox soul, to scrutinise the ascetic trend, and the mystical flights of the Orthodox saints. Precisely the same is the case with Catholicism. The vitalising forces of Western religion are not exhausted by formal scholastic theology. Catholicism has a deeply-rooted mystic life : its heart vibrates to all the strongest impulses of holiness. Khomiakov did not see anything of that inner beauty. To him religious mysticism was a virgin soil. He never cast a glance even on such writings as those of Jacob Böhme. He misconceived Catholicism by identifying it with rationalism and juridical formalism. Vladimir Soloviev was right when he found fault with Khomiakov for setting forth Orthodoxy as an ideal religion while he considered Catholicism only as an historic reality, and for connecting with the former the idea of purity, and with the latter that of corruption. The shortcomings of historic Catholicism are widely enough known, and one need not veil the influence in its

of the Slavophiles

life of the sins of men. But evils of the same kind make their appearance with at least equal frequency in Orthodox Christianity. The faith of a deeply Christian soul need never be staggered by such evils, for holiness, the ever-shining gem of the true Church of Christ, is the real test of fidelity to His teaching. Tried by that test Catholicism need fear no comparison with Orthodoxy or with any other religious system that the world has ever known.

A. PALMIERI, O.S.A.

NOTE.—Some of the theological writings of Alexis Khomiakov have been published in French, *L'Eglise Latine et le Protestantisme*, Lausanne, 1872: some others in English by W. J. Birkbeck, *Russia and the English Church During the Last Fifty Years*, London, 1895. Their whole collection form the second volume of the Russian edition of all the works of Khomiakov, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, Moscow, 1900. Basile Zavitnevich, a professor in the ecclesiastical academy of Kiev, is publishing a monumental work on the life and doctrines of Khomiakov, *Aleksei Stepanovich Khomiakov*, t. I, Kiev, 1902; t. II, *Trudy Khomiakova v oblasti bogosloviia*, Kiev, 1902. We owe to Nicholas Berdiaev the best literary biography of Khomiakov and an acute and unbiased criticism of his theological tenets, *Aleksei Stepanovich Khomiakov*, Moscow, 1912. The works of Vladimir Soloviev have been published in nine volumes, *Works*, Petrograd, 1901-07. Prince Eugene Trubetskoi, professor in the University of Moscow, is the author of a magnificent work which systematises the philosophical and theological views of Soloviev, *Mirosozertztanie Vl. S. Solovieva*, Mosca, 1914 (two volumes). In the first volume of the present writer's *Theologia Dogmatica Orthodoxa Ecclesiae graeco-russicae* (Florentiae, 1911) there is to be found a complete list of the Russian books about Khomiakov and Soloviev, p. 799-805. *Slavianofilstvo kak filosofskoe uchenie*, Journal of the Ministry of Public Instruction, 1880, XI, p. 1-67; P. J. Linitzky, *Slavianofilstvo i Liberalizm*, Kiev, 1882; Krasniuk, *Religiozno-filosofskoe uchenie prezbnikh slavianofilov*, Kharkov, 1900, t. II, p. 93-121; 174-86; M. Lebedev, *Vzaimnoe otnoshenie tserkvi i gosudarstva po vozrneniiu slavianofilov*, Kazan, 1907.

A. P.

ISLÂM : A CHRISTIAN HERESY

THE Mahometan religion has played so large a part, for good or for evil, in the history of the world, and has so profoundly affected the development of civilisation over a large portion of the earth's surface, that the consideration whence it is derived and from what sources it has drawn its inspiration can hardly fail to be of interest to every intelligent student either of history or of religion.

To its own adherents, it is true, the matter presents but little difficulty. "There is no God but Allah, and Muhammad is the prophet of God." Muhammad, indeed, as John before him, did no miracle, but the Kurân, the revelation that he brought, is in the eyes of his followers a standing miracle and the seal and proof of his mission. To speak of "the sources of Islâm" would sound to such as these foolish if not blasphemous, for the religion has come in their idea from God Himself, and, although transmitted through a human medium, owes nothing at all to earthly sources, save so far as some earlier religions were also regarded as true revelations, albeit imperfect, yet coming down from the one and only God and *in their day* true and sufficient for the needs of men.

No Christian critic, I suppose, would find himself able to accept such an explanation of the phenomena of Islâm. It is not that any of us would wish to endorse the unsympathetic judgment of Luther, to take a single example, when he says that Muhammad was a devil incarnate and the worst of men—it is not even, perhaps, when we take into consideration the mighty work that he did for the great dogma of the Divine Unity, that we should wish to deny him, in some secondary sense, the title of a Prophet of God—but it is that the Kurân itself, as also the Aḥadis and the Sunnah, the authoritative traditions of the Prophet's sayings and doings, bear upon them to the eye of a critic, in their errors and misunder-

Islam : a Christian Heresy

standings even more than in their more truthful reproductions of what had gone before, the clear and unmistakeable signs of human teaching rather than of Divine inspiration. Not only is Islâm derived from human sources but it ought to be no difficult task for modern criticism to state with accuracy what those sources were, and how much each has contributed to the finished whole with which we are now familiar.

The answer which is generally given to any question concerning the sources from which Muhammad derived his religious teaching, is to the effect that he was an eclectic, that he found representatives of various religions resident in the neighbourhood of Mecca or even in the city itself, and that he thus built up his religion on a mixed foundation, choosing some and rejecting others of the elements of which each conflicting religion was composed, and thus, with consummate skill, constructed a new religion admirably suited to the mind of his own countrymen—a religion which was destined to succeed marvellously and spread rapidly where the older religions had utterly failed. That conception I believe to be radically unsound and incapable of being reconciled with the facts. To combat it and to put forward another and a simpler hypothesis is the object of this article.

That a large portion of the religion of Islâm is derived from the old heathen religion which prevailed in Arabia before Muhammad was born, is a fact beyond dispute. After breaking away from it in his earlier preaching, the prophet, in his last years, by way of compromise, incorporated many of its more harmless characteristics into his new religion. These, for the most part, are not disputed, and will be dealt with in due course. The real question at issue is to what extent the Jewish and Christian religions have in their turn contributed, and it is to this point that I propose, more or less exclusively, to confine myself. Let us assume then, by way of argument, and in order to clear our ideas on the subject, the theory which, as I have already said, I believe to be mistaken, that the elements which Islâm has in common

Islam: a Christian Heresy

with Judaism and with Christianity were selected out of those religions by Muhammad, and deliberately incorporated into the religion he professed to have been sent of God to teach. The facts, on this hypothesis, will be something as follows.

From Judaism he will have selected the great and standard doctrine of the Unity of God, and have taken over in their entirety the Scriptures of the Old Testament. Jews are constantly spoken of in the Kurân as "The people of the Book," and the inspiration of the Old Testament is always taken for granted, although it is known only at second hand, and in stories which are much altered and have often become grotesque. So again from Judaism will have come the idea of the Kibla, or ceremonial turning at prayer towards Jerusalem, afterwards transferred to Mecca, the whole doctrine of Angels, the *lex talionis*, the details of the marriage law, the degrees of affinity, the stoning of adulterers, and so forth. These are all from authentic and scriptural sources, but besides these there is much that has come from Talmudic lore. Whatever theory we may ultimately adopt with regard to the teachers of Muhammad, we must certainly find room for one instructor who was acquainted either with the Talmud or at least with the kind of teaching out of which the Talmud had been compiled and completed about a hundred years before Muhammad's birth.

On the other hand we must note how much of Judaism has been tacitly rejected. For our present purpose the rejections are quite as important as the portions which have been adopted. That there is a relation of some kind between Islâm and Judaism cannot be denied although it is often exaggerated. Islâm, it has been said, "is nothing more nor less than Judaism plus the Apostleship of Muhammad." That remark is profoundly untrue. For the affinities of Islâm are not with the living religion of Judaism at all, but with a Judaism that has been emasculated, mutilated and deprived of all that made it a vital force in religion. Judaism as continued in Mahometanism knows nothing of the Law as still and per-

Islam: a Christian Heresy

petually binding upon its adherents, has lost its sense of sin with the system of sacrifices which were the symbols which yet effected remission, and, most striking of all, is a Judaism without hope and without meaning, which no longer looks forward to the coming of a Messias who shall tell us all things and set right all that is wrong upon the earth.

If such be the relations between Islâm and Judaism we turn next to examine how the matter stands in connection with Christianity. Here again we shall find obvious similarities and no less obvious differences.

From Christianity Muhammad has taken over the acknowledgment of Jesus as a true Prophet of God and by far the greatest of them all. He acknowledges the Christian scriptures, though he seems to conceive them as consisting of a single book, the *Injil* or Gospel, and as having been given to Jesus in the same way as the Commandments were given to Moses, or as he claimed that the Kurân was being given to himself. He has taken over, oddly enough, the doctrines of the Birth of our Lord from a pure Virgin, of the honour consequently due to the Mother of Jesus, and of the position of Jesus as the Word of God and the promised Messias, though no doubt these words are not used in altogether the same sense which they convey to Christian ears. He acknowledges that Jesus "saw no corruption" but was taken up into heaven, whence He is to come again as Judge in the last day of the world, but only to live once more a human life, to marry and to beget children.

On the other hand, although he would grant so much as this to the Christian position, Muhammad was in no degree a Christian in the orthodox sense of the word. He would in no way admit that our Lord could rightly be called God, or that God could have a Son. He utterly misunderstood the Christian doctrine of the Trinity, supposing that it meant a worship of three separate Gods and that the two subsidiary Persons were our Lord and His blessed Mother, and on these grounds vehemently

Islam: a Christian Heresy

opposed it as destructive of the one dogma he had really assimilated, namely that God is One. "They misbelieve who say 'Verily God is the third of three' . . . The Messiah, the Son of Mary, is only a Prophet . . . and his mother confessed the faith . . . they both ate food" (Surah v. 77). Or again, "And God shall say O Jesus, Son of Mary, hast Thou said to mankind 'Take me and my mother as two Gods besides God.'" (Surah v. 116).

Besides the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ, Muhammad also vehemently denied both the fact of the Crucifixion and the doctrine of the Atonement. Another, so he maintained, had taken the place of Jesus and had been crucified in His place. "They slew not the Messiah and crucified Him not, but had only His likeness" (Surah iv. 155). "The Jews plotted and God plotted; but of those who plot God is ever the best" (Surah iii. 47). For this reason he could not abide the sight of a cross and would break anything that came into his house which had the sign of the cross upon it. So, too, he taught that when Jesus came again, the two great works He would perform would be "to break the crosses and to kill the swine."

It was, therefore, but a maimed Christianity that Muhammad was prepared to accept. In denying the doctrines of the Divinity of Christ and of the Atonement he had taken away everything which is really distinctive of Catholic Christianity. Still the mark of the connection between the two religions is set deep in the customs which he ordained for his followers. The law of clean and unclean food, for instance, is based not on the code of Moses but on the decrees of the Council of Jerusalem, and forbids the eating of blood, and of things offered to idols (Surah v. 5), although to these is added the prohibition of the flesh of swine. It was by baptism that new converts were in the early days of the religion admitted into brotherhood, though at a later time the Prophet abandoned the practice. Christian rules of forgiveness are inculcated on all. "Whoso beareth wrongs and forgiveth—this is a bounden duty." "He who forgiveth

Islam: a Christian Heresy

and maketh peace shall find his reward for it from God ; verily He loveth not those who act unjustly." So again it is recorded that Muhammad would speak to his followers in the very words of Jesus and would say, "Verily God will say in the day of resurrection, O ye sons of men, I was sick and ye did not visit Me. And the sons of men will say, O Thou Defender, how could we visit Thee, for Thou art the Lord of the Universe, and sickness cannot hold Thee? And God will say, O ye sons of men, did ye not know that such a one of My servants was sick, and ye did not visit him" (Abu Huraivah v. I, I. Cf. Matt. xxv. 21).

Now no doubt it is antecedently conceivable that the existing religion of Islâm was actually made and compiled by its founder by means of such an eclectic process of selection from the older religions as would be necessary to produce the result—but if it be intellectually conceivable I would submit that it is practically impossible. One can imagine a University don, or a German professor of Comparative Mythology, sitting down in his study to compile for himself and for others the perfect religion out of the truths contained in existing creeds, keeping what seemed to him true in each one and rejecting the false ; but what one cannot imagine is that either he or anyone else could ever attain to faith in a religion which was thus concocted. Both he and all his followers would know it to be purely eclectic ; human in origin and destitute of real authority. Such a religion might provide an admirable exercise for the study, it would never conquer the world. So academic a theory of its origin supplies us with no explanation for the undoubted enthusiasm which animated the prophet and blazed in the hearts of his followers. Nor as a matter of fact did Muhammad ever possess the intimate acquaintance with the doctrines either of Judaism or of Christianity which would have enabled him to carry out so discriminating and consistent a selection. With Jews especially there is no reason to suppose that he was ever on friendly terms at all, and his language concerning them, although he accepts the truth

Islam: a Christian Heresy

of their religion as a preparatory dispensation, is consistently hostile and unfriendly. "Of all men," says the Kurân, "thou wilt certainly find the Jews . . . to be the most intense in hatred towards those who believe, and thou shalt certainly find those to be nearest to them in affection who say, We are Christians." "God hath sealed up the hearts of the Jews for their unbelief, and for their having uttered a grievous calumny against Mary, and for their saying, Verily we have slain the Messias, the Son of Mary, an Apostle of God."

All this does not lend itself very well to a theory of eclecticism, least of all if Judaism is to be one of the principal sources from which the new religion is to be derived. Almost any other theory which will equally account for the facts would seem on the face of it more probable than this.

We now go on to consider an alternative theory—the theory of an almost exclusively Christian origin—and the simplest way of doing so will probably be to go through the life of Muhammad, pointing out the successive phases of his religious belief and the influences to which he was subjected.

The religion of Arabia at the time of his birth was a traditional heathenism, admitting many subsidiary deities, the patrons of tribes and families, above all of whom, however, was believed to be Allah, the highest and universal God. Since Allah ruled over all and imposed duties on all it was held that one could not enter into practical relations with Him, and accordingly, in actual worship, although in theory the highest of all, He held the last place of all. The chief holy place of Arabia was the Kaaba of Mecca, the sanctuary of a number of tribes, among whom the Koraish, the tribe to which Muhammad himself belonged, was in every way pre-eminent. But religion was effete and decrepit, and already there was a stir among some few religious minds desiring better things. These men, many of whose names are known to us, were known as Hanifs or penitents. They had broken with the idolatry of their nation, but were not

Islam: a Christian Heresy

content with mere negation, and avowed themselves to be seekers after another and a purer faith, giving themselves up to meditation and a life of asceticism. They sought, they were wont to say, the true faith of Abraham their father, and though most of them remained unattached to any definite religion, several are recorded to have found what they sought in adherence to Christianity. Muhammad himself was brought into relation with these Hanifs through Waraka ibn Naufal, a cousin of his wife, who had himself in this way become a Christian. During the early period of Muhammad's life, up to the first revelation, which took place in his fortieth year, we may class him as himself a Hanif, discontented with the heathenism of his country, seeking after the pure religion of Abraham, and to some extent drawn towards Christianity as fulfilling his ideal.

But the Christianity which prevailed in Arabia in Muhammad's time was not of the character most likely to appeal to such a mind as his. It was the Christianity of Abyssinia, the extreme wing of the seventh century Christianity, depending upon Egypt and the Coptic hierarchy with special corruptions of its own, the Eutychian heresy in an extreme form, easily to be confounded with Tritheism and seeming to obscure if not to destroy the great truth of the Unity of God. From this Christianity Muhammad turned away, for it did not satisfy his aspirations. But he was also brought into contact with another form of the Christian religion, a form as extreme on the other side as was the Abyssinian, and in this he found his ideal much more nearly realized.

These Christians, who in the event had, as I maintain, so much to do with the development of Islâm, were the Judaizing heretical sects who occupied the territory beyond Jordan and the desert country towards Babylon. We know but little about them, for they lived in a back-water of Christianity, aloof from all the main springs of progress, and have left no history behind them, although one particular body, the Mandaites, have struggled on in those regions even to the present day. They were

Islam: a Christian Heresy

divided into a great number of sects, many of them gnostic in tendency, and it is possible that we know more about these sects than we do about the great main body, comparatively orthodox in character, among whom Muhammad seems to have found his teachers and from whom he drew his inspiration.

These Judaizing Christians, whom we know by the general name of Ebionites, were the descendants of the Jewish Christians of Palestine, and especially of Jerusalem, who had fled from the city on the approach of the Roman armies, and had taken refuge at Pella, whence they had spread over all the populous and, at that time, prosperous regions on the other side of Jordan. This colony of Christians, cut off as they were both by language and by race from the main stream of Greek-speaking and Gentile Christianity, in which the ideas peculiar to the new religion were rapidly developing themselves and assuming a permanent form, remained wholly Judaic and even reactionary. They looked back to Jerusalem as not merely the cradle but also the centre of their religion, and Christianity was in their eyes not intended to supplant Judaism—that they regarded as a blasphemy and a heresy—but only to fill it in and to give a new direction to the tendency of its development. Hence they kept the Jewish Law as still binding upon them, and regarded St. Paul as a heretic and an enemy, the *homo inimicus* of the parable, who had sowed tares among the wheat. They kept the Jewish Sabbath as well as the Christian Sunday, called their churches by the name of synagogues, and ardently expected a miraculous restoration of Jerusalem to be once more the centre of the religious world, Christian as well as Jewish.

This attitude of mind had its inevitable result on their views of the Person and work of Christ. They regarded Him as the Jewish Messiah, but hardly as the Redeemer of the human race. He was a Prophet, the last and greatest of the prophets no doubt, but still only a prophet—that other prophet whom Moses had foretold that God would raise up like unto Himself. So “the true Prophet”

Islam : a Christian Heresy

was the ordinary phrase by which they designated the Founder of their religion, rarely did they speak of Him as the Christ, never as the Saviour or the Redeemer. They acknowledged a divine interposition at his birth, only the extremest among them regarded him as the son of Joseph, but they denied that He could rightly be spoken of as God, though some of them would call Him the Son of God or The Word. They rejected all the New Testament writings, regarding our Gospels as merely traditionary and subsidiary, while their own one sacred book was the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the total disappearance of which is the greatest loss that New Testament criticism has suffered.

The Ebionites had, therefore, broken with Judaism and yet were hardly Christians. "Wishing," as St. Jerome says, "to be both Jews and Christians, they succeeded only in being neither Jews nor Christians." They had lost the idea of sacrifice, but denied the One Sacrifice which logically removed the obligations of the Jewish Law; they circumcised as well as baptised; were opposed to celibacy on principle; turned to Jerusalem as their Kibla for prayer, and in all the minor usages of religion conformed more or less exactly to the customs of their Jewish forefathers. At the same time they stood apart both from Judaism and from Christianity, rejected and hated by the Jews because they acknowledged Jesus to have been the Messiah, and by the Christians because they would not allow that He was the Incarnate Son of God.

It is even possible, I venture to think, to name the particular sect of Ebionites from whom Muhammad got his teaching. These were probably the Sabians, a sect of whose peculiar doctrines we know absolutely nothing, the voluminous writings by Chwolsen and others on later sects who bore the name having only obscured the subject. Only we may conjecture, from the name, which is equivalent to Baptists, that they held, as we know some Ebionites did, that Baptism was not merely an act done once for all, "one baptism for the remission of sins,"

Islam : a Christian Heresy

but that it needed daily repetition in certain ceremonial ablutions. It may well have been from this source that the ceremonial washings before prayer were adopted into the religion of Islâm. The ground for saying that these Sabians were Muhammad's instructors is principally that he three times names them with the Jews and the Christians as "People of the Book" and to some degree true believers who need not fear in the day of Judgment, and, more particularly, that it is recorded that it was by that name that his earliest followers were known both at Mecca and at Taif. When the Banû Jadhima announced to Khalid their conversion to Islâm they did so in the words "We are become Sabians." To this day Sabi in Arabic denotes a convert.

The connection of Muhammad with these Ebionites began at a quite early age, when he went with his uncle on a commercial journey to Bosrah in the heart of the Ebionite country. On that occasion it was that Bahîrâ, or Girgis, the so-called Nestorian monk, though probably Nestorian only in the sense of being anti-Eutychian, blessed him and prophesied his future greatness. Muhammad made another journey to the same regions when he was 25 years of age, and he may have come across Bahîrâ again on that occasion. In Mecca, too, at a late period there are many traces of Ebionite influence, and Sprenger thinks that Bahîrâ had actually come to live there and was acting as his teacher. Husain, a great commentator on the Kurân, who flourished during the ninth century, says that Muhammad was in the habit of going every evening to a Christian to hear the Taurât, or books of Moses, and the Injil, or Gospel, read aloud to him. Certainly his opponents at Mecca were quite convinced that something of the kind was going on, as we may see from the indignant denials which yet remain in the Kurân itself (Surah xvi. 105). "Do we not know that they are saying, Surely some person is teaching him. But the tongue of him at whom they hint is foreign, while the Kurân is in pure Arabic." "And they say, Tales of the ancients that he hath put in writing, and they were

Islam: a Christian Heresy

dictated to him morn and even." "Verily this Kurân is a fraud of his own devising, and others have helped him with it—others who have come hither on account of outrage and lies."

There is, therefore, no historical difficulty, but rather the reverse, in the way of supposing that Muhammad received instructions from Ebionite teachers. There is no reason to think that he was ever himself actually an Ebionite in any full sense, or that he was fully instructed in the more intimate parts of their religion. But that he drew practically all his teaching in the Mecca period from Ebionite sources, and that in this way Christianity was the ultimate source of his inspiration and enthusiasm, is a position which I venture to think grows upon the mind the more closely it is studied, and gives a complete explanation of all the circumstances of the case, far more simple and reasonable than the alternative one of eclectic selection from Judaism and Christianity alike.

Nor is there any difficulty if we turn to the Kurân itself. The first Surah of all, the starting-point of all Muhammad's revelations, acquires a new meaning if we take it as marking the crisis when he realised that it was from the older and written revelations that he must at first draw his inspiration. It represents the Angel Gabriel coming to him and saying, "Read." And he answered, "I do not read." This was repeated three times, and then came the revelation. "Read, in the name of God the Creator, who made man of clots of blood:—read, for God is good and has taught the use of the pen, and revealed to man that which he knew not." This revelation was followed by the *fatrah*, or pause, during which no further revelation comes to him, and which may have lasted as long as three years, during which time he obeys the angel and studies under Ebionite guidance, and then at length he comes forth with the finished message, which we have in Surah lxxiv., the first, as is generally agreed, after the *fatrah* had come to an end. "Rise, thou that sleepest, rise and preach: saying, Magnify thy Lord, and purify thy raiment, and fly

Islam : a Christian Heresy

from idolatry. Give not favours to receive them again, but wait patiently for the day of the Lord, for He comes with the sound of the trumpet, to bring distress and travail to those who refuse to believe." In the second clause, "purify thy raiment," we have the allusion to some form of baptism, which in Muhammad's idea included the washing of the raiment as well as of the body, and the whole passage reminds one forcibly of the similar preaching of the Baptist or of the earliest Christians, "Repent ye (and be baptized), for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." In the Medina period, when the practice of baptism was given up, we find the trace of the change once more in the Kurân. "They say, moreover, become Jews or Christians that you may have the true guidance. And ye shall answer, We believe in God . . . and have baptism of God, and who is better to baptise than God, for Him do we serve."

From the time of this second revelation to the end of the Mecca period we may regard Muhammad as practically an Ebionite, and to make this quite clear it may be well to pass his teaching in review once more with this idea in our minds. As between Ebionism and the teaching of the Mecca period we have, first, an absolute identity in Christology. In each case Christ is the True Prophet, the Messiah, the Word of God, but not Himself truly God, or the Redeemer of the world. In each case the story of the Cross is obscured, almost forgotten, or even denied. In each case a second coming is looked for, not only a coming to judge the world, but a return to human life.

The coincidence as to the Sacred Books is equally striking. In each case it is the Injil, a single Gospel narrative, all other writings being of a secondary character. Mahometan controversialists, when confronted with discrepancies between the Kurân and our own Gospels, answer that our Gospels are not the Injil, that that is lost, and that our Gospels are only Hadîs, traditions of varying value. The coincidence with the case of the Gospel according to the Hebrews is very striking.

Islam : a Christian Heresy

Another point of contact is provided by the name Nazarenes by which Muhammad uniformly designates all Christians. To the Ebionite the Nazarene, though in a sense he would have claimed the name himself, represented the great body of Christians who were more in contact than he was himself with the main stream of Gentile progress. To all other Christians the name suggested nothing more than Judaizing sects of doubtful orthodoxy. The Abyssinian Christians, for instance, would not have called themselves Nazarenes in the seventh century, and Muhammad's use of the term is, therefore, another clear indication of Ebionite influence, an indication so clear as to be by itself almost conclusive on the point.

Other points, such as the Kibla of Jerusalem, the use of circumcision, the laws on marriage and divorce, the ceremonial washings, and so forth, which are usually spoken of as derived from Judaism, may just as well have come from Judaistic Christianity, and so also may all the stories of the Old Testament. There is really no need for assuming any direct Jewish influence at all, while, on the other hand, the connection with Jewish Christianity is so marked that it would be difficult to name any doctrine which was certainly held by Ebionism which has not left its trace on the Kurân, or, again, any doctrine taught by Muhammad in this later Mecca period which may not have been derived from Ebionite teaching.

One single point seems to require a moment's attention. The remarkable reverence shown by Muhammad to the mother of Jesus seems, at first sight, incompatible with an Ebionite origin. If the Ebionites were really primitive Christians who had not gone with Gentile developments, the objection would be insuperable. Reverence for Mary could never have been developed where there was no belief in the Divinity of her Son. But if the Ebionites had fallen from the primitive faith, as there can be no doubt they had, and had lost the primitive belief in the Incarnation and the Atonement which they once had held, then it is quite conceivable

Islam : a Christian Heresy

that they might have retained a veneration for the mother of God, even when they had lost the logical reason which brought that veneration into existence. From this point of view the interest of the question will be the extremely early development of this veneration if the Ebionites carried it with them from Jerusalem in A.D. 70 and never lost it in the succeeding period, when so much of their hold on other truths of Christianity gradually faded away.

The period at which Muhammad was most under Ebionite influence, and was, indeed, as I should venture to say, himself an Ebionite of a kind, covers the last years at Mecca. In spite of his own enthusiasm and that of his followers, the preaching of the new religion was an utter failure. The vested interests of heathenism were too strong, and the first followers of Muhammad had no choice but to fly to Abyssinia, where it is interesting to note that they were received kindly as in some sort Christians, and Muhammad himself at last found his position untenable and fled from the city to go to the freer atmosphere of Medina. That event, the Hegira, from which all Muhammadans now date their present era, marks alike the starting-point of modern Islâm, and the abandonment by Muhammad himself of any form of Christianity as his exclusive guide. Mecca had rejected Ebionism and had driven him from her borders. Henceforth, if he were to carry out that rôle of the Prophet of Arabia to which he sincerely believed himself called, it could only be by compromise with the forces which had proved too strong for him. Compromise with heathenism is therefore the dominant characteristic of his latest years, and proved triumphantly successful. He retained unbendingly the dogma of the Unity of God, which had always been the centre of his preaching and which had aroused an answering echo in the hearts of his fellow countrymen. He absolutely banished all actual worship of idols or of lesser divinities. But in other matters of less import he was ready to compromise to the uttermost. The Kibla, or ceremonial turning in prayer

Islam : a Christian Heresy

to Jerusalem, had long distressed him as seeming, in view of the unceasing hostility of the Jews, to concede too much to their religion. It was accordingly now altered to Mecca, on the ground of a legendary, or perhaps an imaginary, foundation of the Kaaba by Abraham, the Father of the Faithful. Baptism was given up as a form of initiation, though in some sense retained in ceremonial ablutions. Circumcision was retained, but administered to boys and not to infants, on the ground that Ismael was a boy when he underwent the rite ; the Sabbath and Sunday were alike discarded in favour of Friday ; polygamy was established, allowing four lawful wives at a time and an unlimited number of slave concubines to every believer, but to the Prophet himself no limit either of wives or concubines. Pilgrimage to the Kaaba was enjoined on all, and sacrifice instituted in connection with it. All this was obviously drawn from the older heathenism, and was designed to propitiate the enmity which had been roused, but in every case a divine intimation was alleged, often of the most opportune and convenient character. Indeed the whole character of Muhammad and of his teaching underwent a great and sudden change for the worse so soon as he found himself in supreme power at Medina. While he is at Mecca he commands our respect and even our reverence—a keen searcher after truth, fearless in setting forward what he had learnt, living up to the light that he had obtained, and, though apparently to some extent self-deceived, yet always using his influence for good. But at Medina all this is changed. The impassioned and spiritual poetry of the earlier Suras of the Kurân passes into the long, dreary and polemical assertions of the later. The contrast is extraordinarily striking. “He who at Mecca had been the admonisher and persuader, at Medina is the legislator and the warrior, dictating obedience, and who uses other weapons than the pen of the poet and the scribe.” There indeed we touch the great blot on Muhammad’s character. Like our own Cromwell, and to some degree like Martin Luther, he was so convinced

Islam: a Christian Heresy

of his own mission that he dared to forge the signature of God as the warrant and cause of his own actions, even when these were obviously evil and inexcusable. Had he died at Mecca, before the Hegira, his religion might have spread with less rapidity, but he himself would have stood higher in the estimation of all students of the history of the world's religious movements.

His relation to Christianity in the last years of his life was mainly negative and increasingly hostile. He was no longer in touch with anyone of the Ebionite school, and his only intercourse with Christians will have been with Abyssinians and especially with Miriâm, his Coptic slave and concubine. He was no longer in a teachable mood, and rebelled vehemently against all of which he could not see the meaning. There is little new light to be gained for our immediate purpose from this period, but his misunderstandings of the doctrines he rejects are of interest as tending to show that he had never really been admitted to any full knowledge even of Ebionite Christianity. The two doctrines he most utterly fails to understand are those of the Trinity and of the Eucharist, the very two which under the "discipline of the secret" were never allowed to be taught to heathen or even to catechumens. The discipline of the secret was passing away by the seventh century in Europe and in Asia, but we can readily understand that it would have lasted longer where heathenism was still the dominant power, and Muhammad's words certainly seem to show that it had actuated those who taught him what he knew of Christianity. He knew that Christians held that God was in some sense three, but he supposed our Lord and His Mother to be the other two Persons of the Godhead. Mosheim has told us that there were some present at the Council of Nicæa who also held this, an absolutely mythical statement, and others have quoted the Collyridians, an equally mythical sect, who are said to have offered cakes in sacrifice to the Virgin Mary. The true origin of Muhammad's mistake is another proof of his Ebionite connections. Owing to the Hebrew word for

Islam : a Christian Heresy

spirit, Rua, being of the feminine gender, the Holy Spirit in Aramaic writings was spoken of as feminine. There is a well-known passage quoted by St. Jerome from the Gospel according to the Hebrews : " My mother, the Holy Spirit, took me by one of my hairs, and carried me to Mount Tabor." If we take this passage in conjunction with the title " Mother of God," which was the touchstone of orthodox belief against Nestorianism at any time after the fifth century, we can see easily enough how Muhammad's mistake may have originated.

The only passage in the Kurân which deals with the Holy Eucharist is the Surah called " The Table," which tells how Jesus, at the request of His disciples, called down a furnished table from heaven to feed them and " to become a recurring festival to all and a sign from God." The allusion to the Eucharist is unmistakable, though Moslem commentators deny it. The proof of the discipline of the secret is, however, in the Traditions, which tell us how the Prophet said that on the Table was a single great Fish, broiled but still alive, and that it divided itself among those that were present. Every student of early Christian symbolism will recognize the description, so often set forth in picture on the walls of the Catacombs. *Piscis assus, Christus passus*—the broiled fish is Christ that suffered, the mystical IXΘΥΣ, Ἰησοῦς Χρίστος, Θεοῦ υἱός Σώτηρ—" Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Saviour." We can hardly refer this to Ebionite teaching, for they did not believe in Christ as a Saviour at all, and the Fish is Catholic and not Jewish symbolism, but perhaps this, which belongs to the very last days of Muhammad's life, may represent something of the extra knowledge about Christianity which he got from Miriam or from some other of his Coptic slaves. If so, it is clear that we must count Abyssinian Christianity as well as Ebionite as having some place among the sources of Islâm.

Other and minor sources, such as, for instance, the possibility of Buddhist or Zoroastrian elements in the teaching of Muhammad, I do not propose to discuss. I

Islam : a Christian Heresy

have not the requisite knowledge to do so profitably, nor do I think that these religions had any great influence upon him. The purpose of my pages has been to show that the main source was a Jewish form of Christianity, and therefore that all early Christian tradition was right when it classed Muhammad not as a founder of a new religion, but as a heretic and schismatic who had fallen from Christianity. It was among Christian heretics, it will be remembered, that Dante places him in the *Inferno* :

“ Guardommi e con le man s'aperse il petto,
Dicendo : Or vedi come io mi dilacco ;
Vedi come storpiato e Maometto.”

“He looked at me and tore open his breast with his hand, saying, See how I tear myself asunder, See how maimed is now Muhammad.” He had torn the Church asunder in life, and was condemned in consequence to tear himself asunder for evermore in Hell.

If I have done something to show that this old and traditional opinion is true, as against the modern view of a study-chair eclecticism, the object for which this paper has been written will have been fully achieved.

ARTHUR S. BARNES.

LETTERS *of a* JESUIT FATHER IN THE REIGN OF GEORGE I

THERE was probably no period more trying for Catholics in England than the first half of the eighteenth century. Absolute persecution, with its stimulating call upon the heroic virtues, had been replaced by a system of dull repression. And for the county families who clung to the Faith there was an especial necessity for self-abnegation. When the landed aristocracy was in the hey-day of its glory, it was the lot of the Catholic nobility and gentry to be unable to share in the advantages to which their social position entitled them. By birth they represented some of the most ancient names in England, yet now in those early Georgian days, when family was of such account in politics, their high descent was entirely negated by their religion. Titles, power, wealth, were the rewards of apostasy. We know how wonderfully so many stood the test, and for this constancy a great debt is due to the labours of the Jesuit chaplains. Surely the work of the Society in England during this period will bear comparison with other more brilliant spheres of influence, whether on the Continent or in the foreign mission field.

Turning over some old MSS. in the possession of a Catholic family, I lately came across a series of letters from one of these chaplains. Direct allusions to the religious position of the writer are so carefully excluded that I had read through the majority of the letters before I suspected that they were written by an ecclesiastical person. But when once the clue was given the identification was not difficult, and Mr John Thornton, who at first had seemed merely a remarkably cultured agent or friend of the county people mentioned in his correspondence, stood revealed as a Jesuit Father. For between thirty and forty years he was stationed with

Letters of a Jesuit Father

the Haggerston family in Northumberland, for the greater part of the time at Haggerston Castle, in a remote district near the Cheviot Hills. It was no doubt necessary for him to conceal his religious character from the eyes of prying neighbours; and this he did most successfully by throwing himself heart and soul into the amusements and interests of the gentry round about.

His letters were addressed to Sir Marmaduke Constable, the uncle of the baronet with whom he resided. And from these letters we gather how thoroughly he appreciated his disguise. It had at any rate its alleviations. Here, for instance, is an account of a day with the hounds in 1721 (I retain the original spelling) :

We have only had one day favourable for airing our hounds; we had the good fortune to unkennel a fox of our acquaintance. . . . He led us a chase from Fenwick Park to the noble hills of Heddon . . . giving a view of his person, from thence to Trumble Hill, where thinking he had given us sufficient sport . . . he withdrew into a strong retrenchment near Kielo Chappel, knowing we were religiously disposed and unwilling to break up his Sanctuary . . . had he been followed by your dogs and their managers, alas, the poor rogue had never reached his dwelling.

Mr Thornton's enthusiasm for the chase, indeed, seems to have exceeded that of his lay friends. He often mourns over the fact that Sir Carnaby Haggerston, with whom he lived, cared so little for sport, and wishes himself in Yorkshire, where opportunities would have been more frequent. In a letter written about two years later he thus dwells on the subject. After some long Latin quotations, in which after the manner of the time he loves to indulge, he writes:

Wonder not at this pedantick stream, for sitting solitary upon the housetop, I have a thousand reveries that pass in my brain, ends of verses and sayings of philosophers, and whiles I have Bramham Moor and Littlewood in my fancy with the harmony of your hounds ringing in my ears, and your friend Draper with eager cry animating the doggs to hasten Rene's destiny. But

in the Reign of George I

if at default, or a chance wrong cast be made—Oh, what looks, what geses, what heat, what words do I hear—Till his address renews the cry, and away he follows merrily.

Mr Draper of Beswick was a very famous sportsman of that day.

There can be no doubt that Mr Thornton not only understood but enjoyed what he was writing about, as his fancy pictured the agreeable visits which he had paid to Yorkshire.

There is something rather pathetic in the way the good Father represents himself in his lonely chamber at the top of the old castle at Haggerston. Sir Carnaby, we gather from his own and Mr Thornton's letters, was rather an uncongenial person, not able to enter into the intellectual pursuits of his chaplain, or even inclined to appreciate the sporting side of his character. On the other hand, Sir Marmaduke Constable was evidently more at one with the Jesuit Father in both these respects, and there existed to the end of their lives a warm attachment between them. A Catholic priest in those days was expected to perform very varied offices for his aristocratic friends. It was all part of the disguise perhaps, but was taken full advantage of by the laity for their own convenience. Sir Marmaduke's own chaplain at Everingham at this time was a Benedictine monk, and yet was in the fullest sense of the word the land agent there. Mr Thornton posed rather as the familiar friend of the family in which he lived, and was on an absolute footing of equality with the country gentlemen round him. A very large proportion of these in Northumberland and Yorkshire at this time were Catholics, and the fact that the Jesuit Father so heartily entered into their pursuits would increase his influence with them. He apparently belonged himself to an ancient stock, and uses a seal with his coat of arms, as was the general custom at the time. And yet he made himself useful in all manner of ways. Sometimes he packed up the baronet's clothes. Here is a postscript of a letter to Sir Marmaduke excusing himself for not send-

Letters of a Jesuit Father

ing on some articles by the coach: "I think there are but four caps, some shirts, thread stockings,—the carriage would cost half the worth. I do this domestick for the best, and hope you approve on it." Sometimes he orders wine from the Continent. The various houses of the Society scattered about Europe made it very easy for him to arrange these matters. Evidently in anticipation of a wedding he writes:

Will give you a fair prospect of being provided with as good wine as Bordeaux, and the Grand Duke's vintages can produce. So lett the Goddess Hymen come when she will, she may lick her lips at such Ambrosias—there remains now only the Falerno d'Albano, which I expect daily; then Ganymede himself would leave even Jupiter to be your butler.

The resourceful chaplain was also able to provide dogs for shooting purposes from Spain. He was as great an authority on dogs and horses as on wine. Writing on the subject in 1721, he brings in a name very tragically associated with great events in that neighbourhood a few years earlier. "Robert Stubbs tells me that the man who got my Lady Derwentwater's bitch has an extraordinary pointor from her, but he holds it dear." And again with regard to the shipment of dogs from Spain: "The dogg's name is Solyman, the bitch's Guyaspucua, the one bears a Turkish name, yet I hope will prove of true Spanish blood." This was evidently in anticipation of shooting. "Now if we live I hope we shall meet in the Moor season, and visit the Cheviots."

Accustomed as Mr Thornton was to ride to hounds, we expect him to be an expert on horses. Evidently he has been commissioned to choose one for the Yorkshire squire when he writes: "This has four years' hard meat in him, and is at a just age for service, for ought I know he may perform as well as your beloved Dunny, and Yorkshire may ring with the fame of him." Indeed, our priest was quite at home at a race meeting, or steeplechase perhaps we should call it. He uses the technical terms of the turf of his day, and sometimes mentions sporting personages by their nicknames. As, for instance,

in the Reign of George I

in a letter of 1722 he says: "Our courses at Milfield are over, the Earl of Tankerville got the 60*n* plate, none running against him; he made a present of it to Sir William Middleton, who gave it to the County to be run for next year. The next day 6 gallows ran, Mr Tom Erington won the plate, jockeying, as 'tis said, the whole field. Tempery Tom got his pockets well lined, and his skin filled."

In the various passages so far mentioned there is little to suggest a religious vocation. If Mr Thornton wrote thus to his Catholic friends, we can imagine how he talked to the Protestant hunting and racing men, who no doubt thought they found in him a boon companion. The disguise was certainly complete, but it was also absolutely necessary. If we remember the years to which these letters belong, 1722 and 1723, and the neighbourhood in which they were written, we shall realize that every precaution was essential. Northumberland Catholic families had been deeply involved only seven years earlier in the Jacobite rising, through which Lord Derwentwater and Mr Forster lost their lives. And here, in this very neighbourhood was a Jesuit priest, of all types of Catholicism the most dreaded. Even in these days we know the prejudice associated with that celebrated name: and what the word Jesuit meant to the ordinary Englishman of the early eighteenth century can be better imagined than described. Not that Mr Thornton stood alone, for, as we know from Foley, nearly all this district was then served by the Society. Two of Sir Carnaby Haggerston's uncles were working in the very neighbourhood, one, like Mr Thornton himself, under an assumed name. But the very fact that the Jesuit Fathers were so numerous in Northumberland made it all the more necessary that they should conceal their identity as far as possible. Like their saintly predecessors in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, they were ready to put themselves without fear in the lion's mouth: but they did it with all due precautions both for their own sake and that of the

Letters of a Jesuit Father

sacred cause which they represented. Often, perhaps, their real profession may have been an open secret. Thus they were able to supply the needs of a very considerable Catholic population of all grades of society when more direct methods would have simply spelt disaster.

The letters do not always dwell upon sporting matters: they throw light incidentally on many phases in the life of the period. The prevailing craze of the day amongst country gentlemen was landscape gardening. Many quaint Elizabethan and Stuart creations of the gardener's art must have perished in this "return to Nature"—which was a reaction from the style introduced under Dutch William. Lord Burlington was the principal exponent of landscape gardening, as we see in Pope's poetical epistle addressed to him on the right use of riches:

To build, to plant, whatever you intend
To rear the column, or the arch to bend,
To swell the terrace, or to sink the grot,
In all let Nature never be forgot.
Consult the genius of the place in all
That tells the waters or to rise or fall,
Or helps the ambitious hill the heavens to scale,
Or scoops in circling theatres the vale.

The efforts of the country gentlemen to make Nature more natural may perhaps have been about as spontaneous as these lines. At any rate they tried. Sir Marmaduke Constable himself was an acknowledged master of the art, and even Sir Carnaby Haggerston made an effort. Mr Thornton evidently had little patience with this form of amusement. He writes: "Our diversion consists now in walks, allies parterres, vestoes, Belvideres, grottos, and such like, so that the very name of hunting sounds barbarous." But though he disliked a mere fashionable craze, he loved literature, ancient and modern, as we gather from his constant quotations, and from the fact that, as he tells us, he employed a person to supply him with all the latest publications. Thus

in the Reign of George I

in his remote Northumbrian home he was able to discuss *Gulliver's Travels* almost directly it appeared, much to the surprise of his correspondent.

There is but one guarded allusion to public affairs. We remember how the first Parliament of George I had been elected on the triennial system, but on its own authority had prolonged its existence and that of future Parliaments to seven years. Its limit was reached in 1722. Writing in the spring of that year, Mr Thornton says:

Our foxes are all gone to the Elections. Mr John Clavering is busy serving his cousin Hedworth, whose election comes on on Wednesday next.—Though my "Lord Wallgrave" and Sir John Gage may be highly applauded for what they have done, yet I presume these are but cross steps to the main chance.

This is an interesting allusion to the apostasy which took place at this juncture of Lord Waldegrave, a Catholic nobleman, whose father had been created a peer by James II, and whose mother was that monarch's daughter. Lord Waldegrave had been brought up in Paris as a Catholic, but in this year he took the oath of allegiance and abjuration and his seat in the House of Lords. He became Ambassador at Paris, where the peace policy with France was in the later course of its development, and ultimately he was made an earl, and so "by cross roads reached the main chance" of political advancement—his career being a by no means solitary instance of the temptations to which the Catholic lords sometimes succumbed in the dreary days of the Georges. The member of the Gage family mentioned at the same time represents a similar case. Mr Thornton by mistake speaks of Sir John Gage—he means Sir William, whose elder brother Sir John had died some years previously. The Gages had up to this date played a great part as Catholics, but now we see how the head of the family became a Protestant; and his example was followed by his cousin, who succeeded him as baronet, and was made a viscount, distinguishing himself by his bitter hostility to the Faith, though it is

Letters of a Jesuit Father

said that on his deathbed he sought reconciliation with the Church.

It was this remark about the two perversions which first suggested to my mind that the writer of these letters was a Catholic priest. The Fathers at Stonyhurst referred me to "The Records of the English Province," where may be seen the following entry: "Hunt, John Le Hunt, alias Thornton, John, Father . . . entered the Society 1693, and was professed of the Four Vows March 19th 1722 . . . Chaplain and Missioner at Haggerston Hall . . . Superior of the Durham District 1736." In reference to this entry it is interesting to notice that Father Thornton wrote the letter last quoted on March 5, 1722, only a few days before he was professed of the Four Vows. As Missioner for the neighbourhood the chaplain to a Catholic county family must have had other duties beyond the Hall, though there was not a large congregation at Haggerston. In the Returns of Temporalities made for the Father-General at the Jubilee of 1750 Mr Thornton states the number of his people, using the quaint phraseology adopted by the Society in their correspondence: "My salary from the place is £15 2s. od. From Mrs Durham £8 per annum, customers to shop 110." No doubt a very large proportion of this modest assembly of the Faithful would come from the Haggerston household and estate, and it was probably in the family itself that the chaplain would find the principal sphere of his influence. When Sir Carnaby Haggerston's firstborn appeared on the scene in 1722 Mr Thornton writes joyfully to Uncle Marmaduke Constable expressing himself in his usual queer style:

I am desired by your nephew to acquaint you that yesterday in the evening between the hours of 5 and 6 his Lady though unexpectedly fell in peices, a brave bouncing lad to the joy of all—he requires you the favour of being Godfather—to bless his primo geniture, and relying on your compliance with his request this day the child was christened, and I stood at your nephew's request as your representative.

in the Reign of George I

A few days later he writes again on the same subject:

The sum you mention I shall equally divide for you to the Midwife, Nurse and Keeper—your Godson is strong and vigorous : tis ominous his being born just in the fox hunting season, he may come to follow it more than his Father.

Hope evidently springs eternal in Mr Thornton's breast. If Sir Carnaby was such an indifferent sportsman the future Sir Thomas Haggerston might make things more lively at the old castle in days to come. Curiously enough we have an allusion to the Jesuit Father as he really was himself in those later days which he here so cheerfully anticipates. In a letter from Sir Marmaduke to Sir Carnaby in the year 1742, just twenty years afterwards, Sir Marmaduke writes: "I believe Thornton has grown old and his high spirits quite extinguished—*on attend plus de ses bonnes nouvelles.*" The good baronet, himself now well in the sixties, underlines the French.

To show how from first to last the chaplain looked after the affairs of the children we find Mr Thornton, who had taken such an interest in Master Tom Haggerston's birth, also appointed to attend on him when twenty years later he went a-courting. On this interesting occasion Sir Marmaduke writes to the parents: "Be sure that Thornton and no one else is with him." Indeed the best testimonial to the Father's life work is to be found in the six children who were brought up under his influence—all, as we gather from the large correspondence of this family, excellent Catholics. Of course, as they grew older they went abroad, and two of the girls became nuns, but at every turn Mr Thornton seems to have been consulted. And it is an interesting fact that the two families principally concerned in these letters of two hundred years ago are still wholly faithful to the religion of their ancestors.

One does not expect to find allusions to the more spiritual side of life in this kind of literature. All such topics had to be carefully avoided by the members of a proscribed faith. But Lent is rather a favourite subject,

Letters of a Jesuit Father

and "How does Lent agree with you?" a usual question. There can be no doubt that the season was very strictly kept in these days by the faithful. In Tennyson's *Enoch Arden*, the story of which is placed in the eighteenth century, we find an allusion to such a family as the Haggerstons, when the fisherman is described on his inland journeys:

Enoch's white horse, and Enoch's ocean spoil

Not only to the market cross were known,
But in the leafy lanes behind the down,
Far as the portal warding lion-whelp,
And peacock yew tree of the lonely Hall,
Whose Friday fare was Enoch's ministering.

In looking through the household books for 1739 at Everingham we notice a complete change of diet for the Lenten season, fresh fish, lobsters and eggs entirely taking the place of the large orders for meat. Mr Thornton writes of the attempts made at Haggerston to make this fare as palatable as possible:

Your nephew designs to provide himself with a lobster soup each day in Lent to keep the juices of his body from souring in Spring: assure yourself that the sweetening diet, especially in the spring of the year, lobsters, cockles, oysters and such sort with moderate exercise will be a better remedy, etc. . . .

In the interesting records for the Jubilee year 1750 preserved by Foley under the head *Ministeria Spiritualia* we find an account of each separate Mission. Several of the Returns speak of considerable progress, and, though clothed in the usual cryptic terms, give some idea of the more religious side. Mr Thornton, who was not expansive on these subjects, makes an eminently characteristic entry:

Pray assure our master that our customers here fulfilled exactly punctually all that was required on that occasion: there were also some general confessions, and several received their first Communion. But as for any extraordinary conversion,

in the Reign of George I

notable reconciliation, or any other unusual act of piety, I know of none that I can give any account of.

I must here mention one letter which I discovered late in my researches. This epistle would have proved the profession of the writer if I had not already by that time identified him as a member of the Society. It refers to the destruction of St Omer's College by fire, and bears a remarkable resemblance to a letter on the same occasion written by the Rector of St Omer's and to be found in Foley. This event took place in 1725, and though Father Thornton's letter does not give the year he no doubt refers to the same catastrophe. Writing on October 17, he says:

The lamentable account of the entire destruction by fire of St. Omer's College, which broke out at midnight in the study place by the neglect of the snuff of candles, and it burnt with that rage that in four hours' space the whole square was consumed, and nothing but the Sodality, Church, and Infirmary saved, though very much damaged and little or none of their moveables escaped. This must be allowed a frightful shock and entire overthrow of the fund of my projects. . . . Since now there is a necessity of rebuilding that ancient nursery of religion they will be obliged from the meanness of their own fund to beg the assistance of their friends.

Then quoting a letter from George Jerningham to the Duke of Norfolk in the sixteenth century, Mr Thornton continues:

I should be sorry on this occasion that any person should distinguish himself by a donation so as to merit his arms to be placed at the Front where I could wish to see your own.

We do not know how far this gentle hint appealed to Sir Marmaduke Constable, but he certainly took a warm interest in the affairs of the Society. In the constant allusions to the Jesuits in his own letters he always refers to them as "Thornton's friends." No direct mention is, as a rule, made of any religious community, Mr Thornton's last letter just quoted being an exception in this respect. There is apparently a further allusion to the

Letters of a Jesuit Father

rebuilding of St Omer's College later on in this correspondence, the Jesuit Father telling his friend that

He would be very much obliged if he would set out in a clear light where those quids are to be had which they are at present in want of to rebuild what the fire has consumed.

We know that a generation later the Jesuits were accused of holding immense wealth contrary to the statutes of their Society. There is certainly no evidence of such a state of things in the incident before us. The College was not restored till the time of the next Rector, Father Hyde, only to be dissolved not forty years later by that iniquitous Act of the decadent French Monarchy, which was indeed but the preface to the Revolution and foreshadowed its anti-religious character.

Some light is thrown upon the eternal question of mixed marriages by these racy epistles. Mr Howard, of Corby, had apparently contracted a union of this nature, but from a Catholic point of view it turned out well, for Father Thornton says, "You have, I presume, heard of Mr Howard's success with his Lady. Were polygamy allowed of he would bid fair to make many converts." But there was another case in the neighbourhood not so encouraging. In a letter written in 1725 we read:

Sir George Brown, I hear, is got to Gant, there be-moaning his folly in having tied himself up to an old Prot, who cunningly settled all she had out of his reach, now whether his strategem of withdrawing himself will tender her heart, so as to open her purse *sub judice lis est*, for *auri sacra fames* was certainly his predominant passion in the match.

From a coat of arms in my possession of some Northumberland Browns the late Lord Liverpool judged that they were a branch of the Devonshire family of that name. And, at any rate, by the end of the eighteenth century they had ceased in that line to be a Catholic family, possibly as a result of Sir George's unfortunate matrimonial venture. But this is only conjecture on my part.

in the Reign of George I

Passing allusion is made in the letters to a large number of families in this far northern country who all continued then true to the Faith. We have noticed already the Haggerstons of Haggerston, the Radcliffes of Dilston, the Howards of Corby; and we also find mention of the Claverings of Callaly, the Swinburnes of Capheaton, the Salvins of Croxdale, the Widdringtons, the Smithsons, the Erringtons, the Charltons, the Silvertops, and the Selbys of Biddleston. The last mentioned are supposed to have been immortalized by Sir Walter Scott under another name in *Rob Roy*. And they were connected both by birth and locality with Sir Carnaby Haggerston, Mr Thornton's patron. Indeed, these county people, who all belonged to Northumberland or its immediate neighbourhood, were generally related to each other. So that their combined influence must have made this district, at any rate in its rural parts, almost entirely Catholic. For they all kept chaplains, who gathered round them quite considerable congregations. For instance, at Callaly, even so late as 1773 we read of two hundred persons receiving Confirmation. In the neighbouring towns also the Jesuits had stations; as, for instance, the one mysteriously alluded to above as "Mrs Durham," and another at Gateshead, which was raided by the Duke of Cumberland's soldiers in the "45." The Widdringtons, who had taken such a leading part in the rising of 1715, are often mentioned by Mr Thornton. The head of the family had lost his title through that unfortunate affair, but he was still known as "my lord" by his Catholic friends. Indeed, he or one of the family is constantly alluded to as Marquis Widdrington, a title which we may ascribe to the gratitude of "the King over the water."

When so much depended upon the continuance of the Catholic families, we can imagine that it was very important that they should not be allowed to become extinct. Consequently Father Thornton was always urging Sir Marmaduke to marry, as the historic house of Constable threatened to come to an end in his person. But

Letters of a Jesuit Father

the baronet, who had now reached the age of forty, or more, was by no means anxious to change his condition. There are several allusions to this subject in the correspondence, very obscure in character until one gets some clue to what they are all about. The poet Pope is quoted in this connection. He was all the rage at the time, especially perhaps amongst the Catholic aristocracy, as he had been brought up in the Faith. Indeed, the *Rape of the Lock*, one of Pope's masterpieces, is founded upon an incident in the life of the 7th Lord Petre, an eminent representative of the old religion. Sir Marmaduke and Mr Thornton dwell especially upon a poem called "January and May," not a very attractive effort. In this piece an old gentleman is represented as determined to marry a young girl, but is advised not to be rash by his friend Justin, who has already suffered much in the married state. Sir Marmaduke appears to have quoted Justin's remarks with approval, and Father Thornton proceeds to combat his anti-matrimonial ideas as follows:

I find that Justin, the old Knight's counsellor in Pope's January, that his advice is still more prevailing with you than example, and that conformable to his opinion you resolved to stand clear of those Scylla's and Charibdes he mentions of "Bondage, cost and care," and that an uninterrupted freedom of life, with a moderate use of that restorative sparkling juice, are infinitely more preferable in your choice than the hazard of a better or worse. Yet I presume you'll change your opinion when convinced from your nephew's experience how great and dangerous is the delusion.

This last remark is in reference to the recent marriage of Sir Carnaby Haggerston to Miss Middleton of Stockeld, which turned out very happily. The following month the good Jesuit returns to the charge, this time urging marriage as a religious duty in such a case. Evidently replying to another letter from his friend, he writes:

I find you persist still in being a strong abettor of liberty, are

in the Reign of George I

free and will be so. Freedom, I must own, has intoxicating charms, but you know it is our calling to say *omnis spūs laudet Dmnum*.

Mr Thornton appears to be quoting in a contracted form from the Psalms the words "*Omnis spiritus laudet Dominum*." It is certainly the most religious remark to be found in the letters. But it was all in vain; Sir Marmaduke Constable adhered to his single blessedness, and died in 1746 still a bachelor, leaving his name and estates to his great-nephew, the second son of Sir Carnaby.

The allusion just now to "restorative sparkling juice" reminds us that these letters illustrate the change at the time proceeding in the national taste in wine, the heavy hostile tariff upon French wines gradually driving the lighter vintages out of the market, to be replaced by port, the product of England's faithful little ally in the Peninsula. Here is one among several remarks upon the high price of French wine:

I hope your Bordeaux wine will prove *bon en bouche*, though it be "sawey" in the purse, and will be as sweet as victory though dear bought.

This letter is written early in 1722. Then at the end of 1725 we find the following mention of port:

Your nephew's taste is entirely lost since he came from your house, for our poor maigre claret will not now go down with him. I seldom hear him break forth into "Panygericks" in any kind; but yours must have been certainly an Ambrosian liquor, that he still retains the flavour on't, for nothing now relishes but your Lisbon.

This change in taste was certainly an unfortunate one for the habits of the nation. For our ancestors did not always maintain that "moderate use" which Mr Thornton ascribes to Sir Marmaduke; but consumed port with the same freedom as if it had been claret, with dire results both for themselves and their descendants.

Letters of a Jesuit Father

With regard to the identity of the writer of these interesting letters, our best clue is, no doubt, the coat of arms on the seal used by him. I showed the impression to the Rev C. V. Collier, F.S.A., and he kindly supplied me with the following note on the subject: "The coat of arms on the seal is as follows: Azure, on a bend between six leopards' faces or, a mullet of five points for difference. Crest. A leopard's face between two wings expanded or. This is the arms and crest of Hunt." We have seen that our hero is entered in *The Records of the English Province* as "Hunt, John Le Hunt alias Thornton." It was the custom of the Jesuits at the time often to use their maternal surname as an alias. It is very probable therefore that such was the case in this instance. The Thorntons were a good old Yorkshire family, who adhered in a remarkable manner to the Faith through all vicissitudes. Several of them had been Jesuits, and Foley tells an interesting story about the death of a previous John Thornton, S.J. The Hunts or Le Hunts were also a Catholic family, and had given several members to the Society; and there was a martyr called Thurston Hunt in the time of Elizabeth.

In conclusion let us mention one effect of reading these letters upon the mind. We cannot imagine anything less like the Jesuit of the popular Protestant novel. Here we have a real specimen, not the wild product of a diseased fancy, such as we find pictured in *The Velvet Glove*, or the stories of Mr Joseph Hocking. On one occasion when Sir Marmaduke complained that a letter was rather obscure, Father Thornton replied: "I can't conceive which of my letters wanted a key. I endeavour in all I do to be clear and sincere and love only darkness for rests sake." Our friend was endowed with a saving sense of humour, and no doubt enjoyed a country life in the romantic wilds near Chevy Chase. "We have no ailments" (he says): "the sharpness and purity of our air from an uninterrupted undulation preserve our constitutions sound and vigorous." Certainly this was

in the Reign of George I

so in his own case, as he lived to be eighty-four, dying on the thirty-seventh anniversary of his full profession as a member of the Society. And he left, no doubt, behind him in the lives of his pupils and friends the exhilarating memory of a thoroughly manly and healthy influence.

RICHARD CECIL WILTON.

NOTE.—In reference to Lord Waldegrave mentioned above, an allusion is made to him in the interesting account of the last hours of his cousin James Earl of Derwentwater. The latter apparently received an offer of pardon on condition that he would renounce his faith ; the suggestion being conveyed to him by his relative and fellow-Catholic, Lord Waldegrave. The young Earl of course rejected the proposal, but in reply remarked that as his more worldly friend had tried to do him an earthly service, he would render in return some spiritual help. He then begged Lord Waldegrave to remain faithful to the Catholic Church.

It is thus evident that in 1715, the defection of Lord Waldegrave which Fr. Thornton mentions in 1722, was already anticipated. We are told that on his deathbed the nobleman in question expressed regret in the strongest terms. But stories of this kind are of such frequent occurrence that they are not always to be relied upon.

In the correspondence of Lord Derwentwater " Jack Thornton " is mentioned about 1710. There can be little doubt that the allusion is to the hero of this article.

INFANT MORTALITY AND THE POPULATION

Infant Mortality. By Hugh T. Ashby, B.A., M.D., B.C.,
M.R.C.S. Cambridge: The University Press. Pp. x, 230.
10s. 6d. net.

Population: A Study in Malthusianism. By Professor Warren S.
Thompson, Ph.D., of the Michigan University. London:
P. S. King & Co. Pp. 218. 1.75 dol.

Married Women's Work. Edited by Clementina Black. London:
G. Bell & Sons. Pp. viii, 292. 2s. 6d. net.

AT the present moment, when the war has killed off so many of the population, it behoves us to look facts in the face. How grave they were, even before the present outbreak had aggravated them, may be seen from the three valuable books whose titles stand at the head of this article. I have drawn upon them freely, and my thanks are due to their authors. Everyone interested in the subject should read them at length. The facts and statistics they contain are very important and compiled with much care, and though the point of view of their authors is not that of the Catholic Church, an intelligent reader will be able to supply without difficulty whatever correction may be necessary on this count.

The population of England and Wales is about 37,500,000. The birth-rate for 1915 was 21.9 per thousand living persons; the infant mortality was 110 per thousand births, and the general death-rate 14.8 per thousand.

The birth-rate has fallen steadily since 1876. It was then 36.3 per thousand; in 1910 it had fallen to 26.3, and in 1915 to 21.9 per thousand.

The death-rate since 1910 has remained fairly stationary. The infant mortality had fallen in the last fifteen years from 150 to 95 per thousand births. In the last two years, 1913 and 1914, it has risen again to 105 and 110, owing to severe epidemics of measles and whooping-cough. When we see that the death-rate for 1915 was

Infant Mortality

no less than 14·8 per thousand, the birth-rate only 21·9, and that out of every 1,000 babies born 110 die, it ought to alarm us and urge us to improve the state of affairs.

The two conditions that can be bettered are infant mortality and the birth-rate, and of these let us first consider infant mortality. Roughly speaking, the chief cause of infant mortality is poverty, with its accompanying insanitary conditions and overcrowding. The other causes are: Diarrhœa, rickets and bronchial troubles, measles and whooping cough; alcoholism or syphilis in father or mother; accidents or neglect; congenital malformations; parental ignorance; employment of married women in hard or dangerous work.

Poverty is the greatest cause of infant mortality, as it necessitates overcrowding and insanitary conditions. In Erfurt we find that 505 per thousand of the working classes, 173 per thousand of the middle classes, and 89 per thousand of the rich classes die under one year of age. The poorer part of the community drifts into the worst part of the town, where rents are low, and overcrowding, insanitary conditions, want of air and sunlight, predispose to summer diarrhœa, rickets, bronchial troubles, and the spread of measles and whooping-cough. In a poor neighbourhood the public-house is the most attractive spot, hence you get more alcoholism. Alcoholism leads to neglect and over-laying of children, and immorality. Immorality leads to syphilis. Poverty also obliges the married woman to go out to work. The highest infant mortality rate is found in poor overcrowded towns. In Staleybridge, near Manchester, it is 157 per thousand; in Guildford it is 58 per thousand. Infant mortality does not result in the survival of the fittest, as summer diarrhœa often carries off quite healthy infants; but it does so much damage to the survivors that they are left crippled, and subsequently succumb more easily to bronchitis, measles, or whooping-cough.

Let us now take this first cause, poverty, and consider it more fully. One point which is often overlooked is, that the life of an infant does not begin at birth, but has

Infant Mortality

been going on for nine months previously, during which nine months it is dependent on its mother for nutrition. She cannot, therefore, achieve a fine healthy baby if she has been starved and overworked during these nine prenatal months. Amongst the poor the mother is always the worst-fed of the family, as she gives her best to the husband and children, taking what remains herself; and if the family is very poor this wretched portion of food has to nourish herself and her unborn baby,* with the inevitable result that she becomes thin and anæmic, and has a poor, under-sized, weak baby, with no power of resisting disease; while she herself gets up from her confinement in such a weak condition that her milk ceases, and in a few weeks she has to feed the child artificially. This still further impoverishes the family, as the cow's milk has to be paid for, the cost varying from 1s. to 2s. 6d. per week, according to the age of the child. As in poor neighbourhoods it is difficult to keep the milk cool and covered, flies get in, and if it is warm weather summer diarrhœa starts, and either kills or else cripples the baby for life. Also, unless great care is taken in mixing the baby's food, gastric troubles set in. Artificially fed babies acquire rickets, and succumb more readily to disease. There are twice as many deaths amongst artificially fed babies as amongst breast-fed ones.

Diarrhœa is the chief preventable cause of infant mortality. It is responsible for one-fifth of the total deaths during the first year of life. It attacks artificially fed babies to a much greater extent than breast-fed ones, 95 per cent. of the former dying in proportion to 5 per cent. of the latter. Diarrhœa is present all the year round. It is caused by negligence or chills, by giving the baby indigestible food; or the bottle may be dirty or the milk sour. Again, the baby may be given a comforter, which under any circumstances is bad, but amongst the poor, when it rolls on the floor and is then put directly into the baby's mouth, makes it a wonder

* See *Maternity: Letters from Working-Women*. Collected by the Women's Co-operative Guild. G. Bell & Sons. Pp. xii, 212.

and the Population

that they do not all succumb. Summer diarrhœa begins to increase about the middle of July, and reaches its maximum at the end of August or middle of September. It increases rapidly after two or three weeks of dry, hot weather, and there is a great difference in the infant mortality during a dry hot summer and a cool wet one. In the cool wet summer of 1912 summer diarrhœa only caused 16·5 per cent. of deaths in children under one year, whereas in the hot dry summer of 1911 it caused 28 per cent. High temperatures favour the growth of bacteria, and cow's milk being a very good medium for their growth, the bottle-fed babies suffer most. The common house-fly is the means by which the infection is carried. These flies breed in manure heaps, and when they hatch out, germs and decayed material collect round the hairs on their legs; they then fly and settle on the babies' milk, or even on their faces and lips, and diarrhœa follows. Summer diarrhœa not only causes a high mortality *per se*, but it causes a high mortality afterwards in the survivors, as they are so weakened that they succumb to any slight ailment, and even if they live are crippled for life.

Rickets is a disease almost limited to bottle-fed babies, and is due to improper feeding. It does not appear until the baby is six months old, and does not often kill, but causes life-long deformities, such as bowed legs, crooked spines, contracted chests, digestive troubles and bronchitis, and general weakness. Bronchitis and bronchial pneumonia occur frequently in ricketty and badly nourished babies; also in babies who sleep and live in hot overcrowded rooms. Measles and whooping-cough (now notifiable diseases), with their lung complications, are also the cause of a large number of infantile deaths. Poor people do not realise this, and do not isolate their children when infected, but let them out into the cold of the street, and often take them to see other children with the infection. Indeed, the isolation of children when the family probably lives in two rooms is quite out of the question. The Metropolitan Asylums Board,

Infant Mortality

realising this, have now opened hospitals and take in these two diseases, which ought to lower the mortality and prevent their spreading.

Alcoholism is, of course, responsible for much. If the family income is spent on beer there is naturally less money for the necessities of life. Mr. Rowntree finds that the average weekly amount spent by working-class families on drink is about 6s. If a man is earning 20s. to 25s. per week this is a large slice out of the income. There is more drinking in the slums because the public-house is, as a rule, the only attractive place; it is warm, well-lighted and cheerful, and the life of the poor in the slums is very monotonous. Alcoholic parents tend to produce diseased, epileptic, or mentally defective children, and a large proportion of insane persons have had intemperate parents. Scientific inquiries have lately brought out the fact that daughters of alcoholic fathers are unable to breast-feed their infants, as they have no milk. Dr. Sullivan has carefully entered into the subject of drink, and gives the following figures:—

55·2 per cent. of the babies of drunken mothers die under two years of age.

23·9 per cent. of the babies of sober mothers die under two years of age.

Anyhow, a drunken parent is a poorer parent, and more careless and neglectful of the children.

Alcoholism in parents is the chief cause of the over-laying of infants, and happens usually on Saturday or Sunday nights. The baby is suffocated by being in the same bed with its parents, when it ought to be in a cot of its own. A cot can be made out of a box, banana crate, or a drawer. In 1910 there were 505 deaths from this cause, and the over-laying of babies has since been made a criminal offence. Ignorance often causes women to spend money on alcohol. The tenacious superstition that stout is good for nursing mothers dies hard, and they do not realise that a glass of milk produces in them more milk for the child than all the stout in the United

and the Population

Kingdom. A drunken mother naturally makes the home very miserable for her family, but even in the most degraded it is rare to come across a mother who is not fond of her children. It is with alcoholic parents that you find the children neglected, and that accidents most frequently occur.

Again, alcoholism leads to immorality, and immorality produces syphilis. If the father contracts syphilis he gives it to his wife, and the children who are born subsequently have congenital syphilis. This is one of the chief causes of infant mortality, and if the child does not die directly from the disease it suffers from malnutrition, and is so weakened that it succumbs to any slight ailment that attacks it. It is also the greatest cause of blindness in infants, and even if the baby lives to grow up its life is a martyrdom, as it suffers from eye troubles, nasal troubles, and bone diseases, and often ends by becoming mentally defective. About 50 per cent. of mentally defective children give a positive reaction to syphilis. Syphilis is the chief cause of stillbirths, and is the greatest cause of sterility. In after years it causes nervous troubles and insanity.

Congenital malformations are one of the less frequent causes of infant mortality, and are unpreventable. The chief congenital malformation is of the heart, and usually causes the death of the child before adult life is reached.

Parental ignorance is great on the subject of the rearing of infants, and it is the cause of a good deal of sickness and death, particularly in mill towns where the girls go straight from the schools to the mills, and marry a fellow-worker, and are quite ignorant of household duties and the care of infants.

As to the employment of married women, a good deal of rubbish has been written on this subject. The opinion of most of the medical experts who have investigated this matter is that, on the whole, the employment of married women has no very harmful effect on their health except when they do hard manual labour for long hours, with much standing or lifting of weights, or are engaged in

Infant Mortality

dangerous trades, such as phosphorus works (matches), or lead works (paint or china manufacture). Naturally if a mother can afford to stay at home it is the right place for her, as it makes for her welfare and the welfare of her husband and children. In a home where the work of the house and the care of the children falls entirely on the mother, there is certainly as much work as a pregnant woman ought to do, and probably too much, as there is a good deal of lifting and standing, and the rooms are in all probability small, badly ventilated, dark and cold in winter and hot in summer. The ideal for a pregnant woman is to have light work, with no lifting nor standing nor carrying; short hours, and to work in a sanitary, well-ventilated, light room; but how often do you find these conditions in the homes of the poor? Indeed, their work there is often more arduous than in some of the hygienic factories where the employers are considerate to their work-women.

Again, the father has often badly paid, irregular work, and if the mother does not contribute to the income all the family suffer, especially the mother, who is usually the most unselfish. If she is pregnant and having insufficient nourishment, it will mean that she is a long time recovering from her confinement and that her baby will be small and poorly nourished; and under such conditions it is better for her to do some light paid work, as then she will have more money with which to feed herself and her unborn baby. Statistics which have been drawn up in a poor quarter of Birmingham show the following facts: That in 1910 the infant mortality amongst employed mothers was 153 per thousand; amongst unemployed mothers 161 per thousand. This shows that in a really poor neighbourhood where the men's wages are low the employment of married women is a benefit. The Report of an enquiry undertaken by the Women's Industrial Council confirms this.

In all cases it is well for the mothers to give up work for some weeks before and after the baby is born. Some scheme of insurance should be arranged so that the

and the Population

mother can stay away two months before and two months after the birth of her child, and receive during this time at least half of her wages. Crèches should be established near big works so that mothers can nurse their babies during meal times. In Spain employers are obliged to let their women workers have time for this purpose without making any deduction from their wages.

Much can be done to improve the condition of the mothers by the employment of good midwives, and health visitors who follow on after and who make themselves the friends of the family, and help and teach and advise the mother on the best way of managing. Pamphlets would be useful, but they are seldom read. Baby clinics and "Mothers' Welfares" ought to be established in every poor neighbourhood, where a doctor and a trained nurse attend weekly, weigh the babies, and give advice as to their feeding, clothing and general management. Attached to this there ought to be an ante-natal clinic where expectant mothers are examined by the doctor and advice given. Also good cheap midday meals should be served for the mothers, and in cases of extreme poverty they should be given free. Many mothers who have attended a clinic and had these dinners say that their subsequent child was born heavier and healthier, and that they themselves got up in a better state of health. Since July, 1914, the Local Government Board has encouraged and helped to finance Child Welfare and ante-natal clinics.

The ignorance of the mothers can be overcome by demonstrations and lectures on how to clothe, feed and bring up the baby, and on the danger of flies; and neglectful mothers can be stimulated to take better care of their infants by judicious advice and praise. Girls should be instructed at school on the management of babies. In one quarter of Paris the infant mortality was reduced to half by the founding of clinics where a doctor and nurse attended, and where the expectant mother was examined and if ill-nourished given food and medicine. After the birth of the baby it was brought up to the

Infant Mortality

clinic to be weighed, and if not thriving it was weighed before and after the breast-feed to see if it were having sufficient nourishment. If necessary the mother was given milk to drink, and if this failed she was given milk for the baby to supplement the breast-feeding.

A very necessary precaution in poor neighbourhoods is to see that the milk supply is good and moderate in price, and if not to establish a supply in connection with the clinic. Hygienic baby clothes and banana crates fitted up as cradles should be sold cheaply. Crèches or baby hospitals should be established in connection with the clinics, and then difficult cases and summer diarrhoea could be taken in and treated.

Isolation hospitals should be founded to take in measles and whooping-cough. Lectures should be given to fathers as well as to mothers on the danger to themselves and their families of drink and immorality. Social clubs should be founded in the slums for men and women where food and non-alcoholic drinks could be had in comfortable and cheerful surroundings, to counteract the attractions of the public-houses.

At Dunedin, in New Zealand, Dr. Truby King has done much to lessen infant mortality. He founded a Baby's Hospital, where an infant suffering from malnutrition or similar troubles is taken in with its mother for a week or two; the cause of the trouble is sought for and remedied, and the mothers taught how to manage. Great stress is laid on calculating the requirements of the baby in calories, and the babies are weighed before and after successive breast-feeds in order to see if the food taken is sufficient. His nurses are very carefully trained, and some are set apart to work among the people of the town, so that any mother in trouble can telephone or send for one and obtain her advice and help gratis.

With war reducing our population, and the birth-rate declining in all civilised countries except Bulgaria, Roumania and Japan, it is wise to study the laws that regulate its growth. One of the first persons to study this question was Malthus, and apart from his theories,

and the Population

many of his purely scientific propositions hold good at the present time. Take for instance the following :—

I. Population is necessarily limited by means of subsistence.

II. Population invariably increases where the means of subsistence increases, unless prevented by some powerful and obvious checks.

III. These checks and the checks which repress the superior power of the population and bring its effects level with the means of subsistence, are all resolvable into moral restraint, vice, and misery.

Malthus also states that population, if unchecked in its growth, tends to increase in a geometrical ratio, whilst food can only increase in a mathematical ratio. In other words, he holds that man is doomed to perpetual suffering because there is a strong tendency for the population to exceed the food supply.

That population ceases to increase at the same rate as formerly is true, but that the limitation of food is as great as Malthus expected is not so true, thanks to the rapid distribution of food by trains, boats, and the cutting of the Suez and Panama Canals ; thanks also to chemical manure and the employment of agricultural machinery, by means of which more waste land has been brought into cultivation, though at such a cost that it has not materially lessened the price of food. As big cities and factories are built all over the world there is less ground space to breed cattle on, or to grow foodstuffs, and as the money made by manufactories seems to be a return of money to the few rather than food to the many, there is an increasing urban population which has not enough to eat. In all parts of the world the price of foodstuffs since 1907 has been steadily rising, and as wages since 1900 have not kept pace with the food prices, the workman is not to-day so well off as he was in 1900. This decrease in the purchasing power of wages seems to be true of all civilised countries except France. In France the working man has been able to command since 1900 a steady advance of wages, and as a larger proportion of the population is engaged in agricultural pursuits, and

Infant Mortality

the country has not competed for industrial and commercial supremacy, food is more plentiful and the working man has been able to raise his standard of living.

The birth-rate in this country reached its maximum in 1876, when it was 36.3 per thousand; since then it has decreased to 21.9 per thousand. Dr. Newsholm maintains that volitional limitation of the family is the chief and vastly predominant cause of the decline in the birth-rate. It is no part of my present intention to discuss the morality of the practices involved. That pertains rather to the clergy and theologians than to the medical profession. Here it may be enough to note that the uncompromising hostility of the Church to every kind of artificial limitation seems to have kept that evil practice to a great extent at bay among populations that are strongly Catholic, while it is precisely where Catholicism is weakest that it seems to have made the greatest progress.

Among non-Catholics this limitation of the family is chiefly taking place in the thinking part of the population, and is largely due to the increase in the price of commodities. Parents who have a large family have to deprive themselves of many things that they have been used to, and, looking at the matter from one point of view, dread the possibility of not being able to give their children as good an education as they themselves had. It spells race-deterioration for the intelligent members only of the community to restrain the size of their families, for it means that the future population depends on the unintelligent. Herbert Spencer maintains that the fertility of the race diminishes with its intellectual and moral development, but this has not been proved.

Among checks to the population are severe labour, exposure to great heat or cold, extreme poverty, the bad nursing and bringing-up of children in large towns, epidemics, plague, famine, and war.

That the population increases where the means of subsistence increase is best seen in the United States of America. In the early days of 1860 the natural increase

and the Population

of the population was 35·6; in 1880 it was 30·1, whereas in England in 1880 it was 10·8. In America from 1860-1880 food and work were plentiful, the birth-rate increased and immigration increased; but since 1880 the birth-rate and the natural increase have decreased, as food is scarcer owing to the exhaustion of the land by building large towns and factories; and people who in the earlier days grew their own fruit and vegetables are now obliged to buy these from the markets.

If we wish to increase and improve our race it should be from the intelligent part of the community. And in order to enable the community to become thus intelligent and also healthy, we must see that everyone is well housed, fed, and educated, and receiving an adequate wage. Insanitary, overcrowded parts of towns should be pulled down, and all people alike taught to lead simple lives. Luxury and idleness must be done away with, and a great portion of the city population attracted back to the land to supply food for the nation. Manufactories which produce luxuries should be closed, and the profits from industries more evenly distributed. With such conditions the increase of the race would come in ever larger proportion from the intelligent, that is also the far-seeing, portion of the community, and then only would race-increase connote race-improvement.

ALICE VOWE JOHNSON.

A VERSATILE BISHOP OF THE FIFTH CENTURY

The Letters of Sidonius. Translated, with Introduction and Notes, by O. M. Dalton, M.A. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1915.

IN the spring of 1900 I visited parts of the Auvergne, and during my stay at Clermont-Ferrand took several drives around the extinct volcanoes of the neighbourhood. In one of these excursions I stopped near a small picturesque lake, Lac d'Aydat, round which I walked with my kodak. In a solitary spot on its shore I came upon a small monument in the form of an altar, bearing the simple inscription SIDONIO APOLLINARI, without any date. It was an agreeable surprise to meet such a recognition of one whose name is so associated with this region.

Little attention has been given in our own country to this writer. His letters have been recently published, translated by Mr. O. M. Dalton, of the British Museum, and this is the first time that a complete translation of them has ever been made into English. The mannerisms of his style and his occasional obscurity partly account for this; and, still more perhaps than the general harshness and turgidity of the Gallo-Roman literature of the fifth century, the late recognition of his value as an historical authority has caused an undue neglect of his writings. Gibbon, indeed, used him largely as an original and trustworthy authority for his age, but he cannot rise to any higher praise of him than that his "prose, however vitiated by a false and affected taste, is much superior to his insipid verses." * It is on the value of much of his subject matter that his title to a place among Latin authors mainly rests; as Mr. Dalton says: "The letters of Sidonius are in many ways the richest source of information on Roman provincial life during the last

* Vol. iv, ch. xxxv.

A Versatile Bishop

years of the Empire in the West." The close of the fifth century was a period of upheaval and unrest, full of perplexity and difficulty, embracing as it does "the calamities of the Gothic War, the final submergence of the Western Empire under the barbarians, the rise of heresies in the Church, the spread of Monasticism, the extinction of Paganism."* The *Getica* of Jornandes, an abridgment of a lost work of Cassiodorus, was not written till A.D. 551, some sixty years after the death of Sidonius, who not only was a witness but an actor in the momentous events of those years, many of the details of which, given us at first hand, are nowhere else to be found.

The period of his lifetime witnessed at least two highly important events in history—(1) the defeat of the Huns under Attila in the so-called battle of Châlons, A.D. 451, so decisive of the fate of Europe, the life-and-death struggle between savagery on the one side and Christianity and civilisation on the other; (2) the extinction by Odoacer, chief of the Heruli, of the Western Empire in the person of Romulus Augustulus, A.D. 476. Mr. Dalton's Introduction to the letters, followed by a Bibliography and a most useful list of correspondents, contains a sketch of the career of Sidonius, with an estimate of his character, and also a criticism of him as an author. It is a very scholarly piece of work, full, lucid and impartial. He does not spare him in his censure of the glaring defects of his language and style, but traces them to the perverted intellectual environment of the age. "The whole training was rooted in traditions no longer vital; it was essentially bookish, uninterested in facts, almost exclusively absorbed in words." And while he laments the omission to supply more ample information on such subjects as the barbarian tribes, the towns, the monasteries, the churches, he fully allows the debt which we owe him for what he has supplied, recognizing the gift for portraiture which lends animation to his pages, the

* *Gibbon*, by J. C. Morrison, ch. vii.

A Versatile Bishop

assistance he renders to archæological research, and the light he throws upon contemporary customs and observances.

The life of Caius Sollius Apollinaris Sidonius (such was his full name) falls under two divisions of unequal length, the first forty years reaching from his birth at Lyons about the year A.D. 431 to his election as Bishop in 471; the second containing the eighteen years of his episcopate. He came of a distinguished Gallo-Roman family, both his father and his grandfather having held the high office of *praefectus praetorio** of Gaul. His education was one in words rather than in things. This is the mark set on his whole life, though in his later years the practical side of his character also comes out. From his youth he was deeply infected with the rhetoric, the artificiality, the pomposity, and *préciosité* of his times. About the time of the Hunnish invasion he married Papianilla, the only daughter of the most powerful citizen of Auvergne, Avitus, who afterwards became Emperor, until he was deposed by Ricimer after a reign of fourteen months. It was owing to this tie that Sidonius was introduced to the stage of imperial politics. For a panegyric made at Rome on his father-in-law he was honoured by a brazen statue in the Forum of Trajan. In 459 he induced Majorian, the only one of note among the shadowy Emperors of this period, to remit the heavy taxes he imposed on Lyons after its capture. We find him again at Rome for two years, 467-9, pleading the cause of the people of Auvergne.

At the age of thirty-eight he retired from public life to the charming villa of Avitacum (Aydac), into possession of which he came through his wife. There he lived as grand seigneur, and wrote on all manner of subjects, letters and poems to his friends, complimentary verses, inscriptions and requests for churches, elaborate descriptions of the upper class of Gallo-Roman Society.

* The praetorian prefect had become the immediate representative of the Emperor, the second personage in the State, the supreme judge of appeal, and his sentence was final and absolute.

of the Fifth Century

In one* of these letters addressed to Eriphius during a visit to Lyons, on the occasion of a Church gathering in commemoration of St. Justin, Sidonius describes his own activity in ball play or tennis, while his friend Philomatius, the father-in-law of Eriphius, found the exercise too much for him, and had to retire from the game in pain.

In the year 471 the people of Auvergne loudly demanded that Sidonius, although not ordained, should become their Bishop. He tells us that he accepted the call reluctantly, and there is no reason to doubt his sincerity, or for thinking that he accepted the office because he saw no chance of any further promotion in the State. A great change came over him. He gave up writing verses of a light kind. It was the crucial event of his life. He became a diligent student of Scripture, and one of the most devoted of pastors and spiritual governors,† sharing the dangers and miseries of his flock in the Visigothic invasion, persecuted by the Arian Euric and banished for a time by him to the fortress of Livia near Carcassonne. In the stubborn but vain resistance of the Arvernians, who at last yielded to the Visigoths, the Bishop took a prominent part, and bitterly did he lament their desertion by Rome. To this date the origin of Litanies or Rogations, special prayers for times of calamities, adopted by Sidonius from the Church of Vienne, is to be traced. It is possible that the occasion was the latest volcanic eruption in the neighbourhood of Clermont.‡

The moral influence of the bishops of the century was very great, and they often successfully encountered the difficulties and troubles of their times. The one way to be of use was to become a bishop. Sidonius accepts

* Ep. v, 5.

† Sir Samuel Dill, *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire*, Bk. II, ch. iv.

‡ This is how in his *Volcanoes*, ch. iii, Professor Bonney understands the passage (Ep. VII, 12), *Ignes saepe flammati caducas culminum cristas superjecto favillarum monte tumulabant*: "Fires often blazing piled a mound of ashes on the tottering mountain crests."

A Versatile Bishop

all the responsibilities of his post. We find him corresponding with almost all the Gothic Bishops, e.g., Lupus of Troyes, S. Remi of Reims, Patiens of Lyons, Mamertus of Vienne, Basilius of Aix. It was probably about the year 487 that he died of a fever, but the exact date of his death is not known. Gregory of Tours tells us how he met his end with calmness, and when he felt its approach desired to be carried to the Church where he had been used to officiate, and how a crowd of men, women and children followed him, weeping passionately. After his death he was canonised, and his day, August 23, is still kept at Clermont.

There were two types of a bishop in the Church of Gaul in the fifth century,* the monastic and the aristocratic, and it was to the latter naturally from his whole career prior to being elected bishop, from his wealth, his connections, his position as a great land proprietor, that Sidonius belonged. But there was no overweening class-pride in his character. We cannot altogether acquit him of a certain amount of servility and flattery in his early panegyrics. He had a genius for friendship, and the circle of his friends was very large. He lived for the most part among his own people, whom he loved and protected. He was eminently broad-minded and tolerant, commending a Jew to one of his friends, admiring though himself not aspiring to the ascetic character, and jealous for the preservation of all the good elements of ancient literature.

But it is in his writings to which we come, and in the light that they throw on the society of his time, that the principal importance of Sidonius lies. His works consist of 147 letters with two included in his poems, and twenty-four poems besides verses included in the letters. The earliest edition of his works that has a date is the small folio printed at Milan, A.D. 1498, a shapely volume of which I possess a copy. The letters are printed first, but they really belong to the author's maturer years.

* Dill, Bk. II, ch. 4.

of the Fifth Century

From his earliest days Sidonius displayed a fatal facility for versifying.* He could write on any subject proposed to him and at any time, even in the rigours of the Auvergne winter, when he had sometimes, he says, to break the frozen ink which he was using. He was well acquainted with classical literature, and with that of his own age such as it was, of which almost the only representatives worth mentioning are Leo I., Salvian and Mamertus Claudianus, who dedicated his book *De statu animæ* to Sidonius. Gaul no doubt retained a certain amount of ancient culture longer than other parts of the Western Empire, but all real original productiveness had ceased. We find a strange fusion of paganism and Christianity, of lofty truths and gross errors. There is erudition and mythology and rhetoric, but a poverty of great thought, and a redundancy of conventional phrases. Of no one is Buffon's expression *Le style est l'homme même* more true than of Sidonius, whose fluency, vanity and good nature is reflected in all that he wrote. His Latinity is Gallic. It abounds in strange and harsh word-formations (e.g., *cervicositas*) "that would have made Quintilian stare and gasp." It has not the true ring of its classical models. The language was in a state of transition, due to the adoption of common speech,† and the influence of Celtic, indications of which are the substitution of *quia* and *quod* for the infinitive, and of prepositions like *de* for the cases, the analytical stage of language already beginning to succeed to that of the synthetic. Occasional false quantities also occur in his metrical pieces which are largely imitative, especially of Statius and Lucan. The ore is difficult to extract, but it is there in the flashes of light which relieve the shadows of a century not too rich in original authorities. Although Sidonius rightly declined to write a history of Attila's

* He could improvise an elegiac quatrain and write it on the bath-towel in the tennis court, *Sphæristerium*. Ep. v, 5.

† Sidonius himself, Ep. viii, 15, says of his letters "non urbanus lepos inest sed pagana simplicitas."

A Versatile Bishop

Invasion and of Euric when asked to do so, and though we cannot but regret with Dr. Hodgkin that he wasted the opportunities he had of becoming the Herodotus of his age, and transmitting to us valuable pictures of the laws and customs, the songs and tales of the barbarians whom he despised, still we must be thankful to him for the many glimpses he has left us of the inner life of his contemporaries—intellectual, moral and social.

The letters of Sidonius describe only a single class of Roman society—(i.e., the aristocratic)—but they describe the class with a faithfulness which leaves little to be desired.*

The decay of the Middle Class was extreme. The wealthy members of the senatorial and patrician rank spent their time amidst the luxurious the highly refined and enervating influences of the bath and the banquet, the cultivation of their estates, hunting expeditions and visits to their prosperous friends. We must remember how their life was freed from petty household worries and cares by the vast troops of slaves, the *familia*, the term which Sidonius still uses in its old classic sense: how it was furnished with libraries and apartments reserved for quiet study, how it was guarded from gross coarseness by its enthusiasm for literary pursuits, albeit devoid of the fire of originality: how excellent were the great Roman roads, how varied the facilities of locomotion, by land or by water, by driving or riding, not inferior indeed to those of our forefathers at the end of the eighteenth and in the first decades of the nineteenth century.

A typical passage from the correspondence of Sidonius is the description of Aventicum and the daily life in that Villa.† Our space does not allow of an entire quotation, and an abridgment would not do it justice. It is an obvious imitation of Pliny's well-known picture of his Laurentinum on the Latian coast. One of the most interesting of the letters is the description of the Arian

* Dill, Bk. II, ch. 4.

† Ep. II, 2.

of the Fifth Century

Theodoric II., written probably from the Visigothic Court at Toulouse. The following extracts will supply a good specimen of Mr. Dalton's translations.

You have often begged a description of Theodoric the Gothic king.

Well, he is a man worth knowing, even by those who cannot enjoy his close acquaintance, so happily have Providence and Nature joined to endow him with the perfect gifts of fortune; his way of life is such that not even the envy which lies in wait for kings can rob him of his proper praise. And first as to his person. He is well set up, in height above the average man, but below the giant. His head is round, with curled hair retreating somewhat from brow to crown. His nervous neck is free from disfiguring knots. The eyebrows are bushy and arched; when the lids droop, the lashes reach almost half-way down the cheeks. The upper ears are buried under overlying locks, after the fashion of his race. The nose is finely aquiline; the lips are thin and not enlarged by undue distension of the mouth.

Now for the routine of his public life. Before daybreak he goes with a very small suite to attend the service of his priests. He prays with assiduity, but, if I may speak in confidence, one may suspect more of habit than conviction in this piety. Administrative duties of the kingdom take up the rest of the morning. Armed nobles stand about the royal seat; the mass of guards in their garb of skins are admitted that they may be within call, but kept at the threshold for quiet's sake; only a murmur of them comes in from their post at the doors, between the curtain and the outer barrier. And now the foreign envoys are introduced. The king hears them out, and says little; if a thing needs more discussion he puts it off, but accelerates matters ripe for dispatch. The second hour arrives; he rises from the throne to inspect his treasure chamber or stable. If the chase is the order of the day, he joins it, but never carries his bow at his side, considering this derogatory to royal state.

The siesta after dinner is always slight, and sometimes intermitted. When inclined for the board-game, he is quick to gather up the dice, examines them with care, shakes the box with expert hand, throws rapidly, humorously apostrophises them, and patiently waits the issue. Silent at a good throw, he makes merry over a bad, annoyed by neither fortune, and always the philosopher. . . . About the ninth hour the burden of government begins again. Back come the importunates, back the ushers

A Versatile Bishop

to remove them ; on all sides buzz the voices of petitioners, a sound which lasts till evening, and does not diminish till interrupted by the royal repast.

The twenty-four metrical pieces of Sidonius, some of them minutely descriptive, others lengthy panegyrics, occasional verses written for dinner parties or for the consecration of Churches, e.g., Tours and Lyons, hardly merit the name of poetry. They are ingenious, but, on the whole, are a monument of wasted talents. His favourite metre is the hendecasyllabic, a pleasing one for light effusions, but intolerably tedious when extended, as it is in an address to Consentius, to more than 500 lines. The author himself seems conscious of this and begs his friend's pardon.

Sed iam te veniam loquacitati
Quingenti hendecasyllabi precantur.

The best of his Epigrams is the one in which he intreats the Emperor Majorian, as a new Hercules, to save his life by cutting off three of his heads, personifying his capitation tax at Lyons under the figure of the three-headed monster.

Geryonen nos esse puta, monstrumque tributum :
Hic *capita* ut vivam tu mihi tolle tria.

After accepting the Episcopate, Sidonius at times relapsed into verse making. Perhaps his thoughts "sometimes ran on Helicon and Parnassus when he was celebrating the Divine Mysteries."* We do not quarrel with him for versifying, but only regret that what he wrote was not less overlaid with pagan and mythological tags—"transitory and accidental ornaments."

The pathetic thought that must occur to every serious student of the fifth century is the almost complete unconsciousness of what was coming. "As it was in the days of Noah. They did eat, they drank," until the awful catastrophe overwhelmed them. "If thou hadst known

* Hodgkin.

of the Fifth Century

in this thy day the things that belong unto thy peace!" The collapse of the Western Empire was as little suspected by those comfort-loving Gallo-Romans as was the doom of the *Ancien Régime* by the Noblesse and Clergy in 1789. The social pleasures and general tranquillity of country life blinded their eyes to the slow but sure advance of the barbarian hordes; the storm that was gathering from the times of Alaric at the end of the fourth, and of Attila in the fifth, to that of Clovis at the opening of the sixth century. It was like the stillness preceding an earthquake, or "The torrent's smoothness ere it dash below."

The end of the fifth century and the opening of the sixth was a time of transition in more ways than one. We have seen this in language. It is seen also in the spread of monasticism, and in architecture. The palaces of the Gallo-Roman nobles are beginning to be surrounded with walls, and have defensive towers,*

ambiet altis

moenibus et celsae transmittent aera tures,

in the style that resulted in the Mediæval French fortified Chateau. In literature the change becomes very marked. With Gregory of Tours, who was born about fifty years after the death of Sidonius, there is a break with antiquity. The classical element dies out, and gives place to Ecclesiastical History and Lives of the Saints and Martyrs written in a rude unpolished style. To pass from Sidonius to Gregory is to pass from one society, or one kind of civilisation, to another.

FRANCIS ST. JOHN THACKERAY.

* *Sidon. Apoll.*, Cam. xxii, 593

CLAUSE-LENGTH IN ENGLISH PROSE

RECENTLY, in this REVIEW, I set down some remarks on rhythm and colour in prose, and expressed the wish that Professor Saintsbury would add to his *Histories of English Prosody and English Prose Rhythm* a third work, which should deal with the use of musical sound and colour in prose and poetry.

There is another subject on which Professor Saintsbury has not said enough—he has said something, and has led us to desire more—a volume is scarcely needed, but an excursus would suffice—as to the rhythms not of syllables but of clauses. For besides the interior rhythm in each clause, he has led us to recognize a vaster “rhythm-sweep” in Hooker and Ruskin, the heaping up of clauses one upon another (often very awkwardly by Hooker, so as to result in absolute clumsiness and obscurity, yet often featly and most harmoniously), and to be enthusiastic over the cunning and successful marshalling of cola in due array. He bids us note how this larger strategy is wanting in the wonderful prose of Malory, miraculous as it is for its age. He remarks (of course) upon the antithetic parallelism of the eighteenth century, which rises to its acme of pointedness in Johnson’s sententious periods, but becomes maddening when real point is wanting. In Macaulay it sometimes jumps at you and hits you in the eye; but it is bearable, because it has a genuine meaning. Still there is a great deal more to be said about clause-length and clause arrangement.

The tremendous rhythm-sweep of Hooker, the page-long paragraphs of Ruskin are *tours de force* which few could imitate. “Standard prose” or “Augustan prose” prefers shorter periods. Gibbon’s sentences are not very long. Johnson’s are rather short. It is obviously their sententiousness which is the parent of their conciseness, and it may seem like a descendant of the proverb-like phrases of Bacon’s essays. But Gibbon and Johnson have

Clause-Length in English Prose

combined rhythmical flow with terseness. Johnson divides his short sentences by semicolons, rather than by full stops, as in the latter part of the following random example:

There was, therefore, before the time of Dryden no poetical diction, no system of words at once refined from the grossness of domestic use, and free from the harshness of terms appropriated to particular arts. Words too familiar or too remote, defeat the purpose of a poet. From those sounds which we hear on small or on coarse occasions, we do not easily receive strong impressions, or delightful images; and words to which we are nearly strangers, whenever they occur, draw that attention on themselves which they should transmit to things. Those happy combinations of words which distinguish poetry from prose had been rarely attempted; we had few elegancies or flowers of speech; the roses had not yet been plucked from the bramble, or different colours had not been joined to enliven one another.

But the eighteenth century itself was not in love with this positive and didactic style. It delighted in the lighter wit of Addison, and the playful or seemingly careless art of Horace Walpole's letters, or Cowper's or Gray's. Goldsmith set a model of variety in clause length. The standard prose of the early nineteenth century is at its best in Southey, whose periods are easy, long and flowing, when compared with Gibbonesque and Johnsonian parallelism and brevity.

But in none of these writers do we find the "Asiatic" style, which came into sudden and brief vogue after the age of Demosthenes, and remained as a frequent ornament in Greek and Roman oratory. It was a style that could be bombastic and redundant, flowery and rococo, but it aimed at colour and tone. It loved descriptions, it loved vividness and movement. Consequently it developed the short sentence, and set clause beside clause without conjunctions, so that the connexion or opposition of sense should be the more noticed from not being a matter of grammar. The poets have always used this asyndeton of clauses; but I do not know that it is found in eighteenth century prose, except in the playful style. Yet the short

Clause-Length in English Prose

sentence style is necessary to vividness and movement, and it is capable of as much grandeur as is the vast rhythm-sweep of Hooker or the antithetical style of Gibbon.

Now Professor Saintsbury has dealt somewhat amply with rhythm-sweep and he has said nothing of the "Asiatic" short clauses, except (unavoidably) when he speaks of Macaulay. Of course a History of Prose Rhythm does not pretend to deal with clause-lengths. But Professor Saintsbury has written so admirably on the waves within waves of the great paragraphs, that one wishes to know the history and the theory of the less intricate but more rapid method.

Macaulay is an unfortunate example, for he has run the short sentence to death, and has combined it solely with the eighteenth century antithetical manner, instead of with the Asiatic gorgeousness which belongs to it of right. But Macaulay is extremely readable, and it is nonsense to say that a readable style is not on the whole a good style. The sustained rhythm of Gibbon is tiring; and it would be a relief to come down from time to time to a pedestrian style like that of (say) Defoe. Macaulay may become annoying, but not tiresome. He is readable because of, as well as in spite of, his mannerisms. As to his little sentences, Professor Saintsbury says: "It seems sometimes as if the writer has joined a secret and yet open society—the principle of which was to use no comma. The sentences come out like cartridges from a magazine, or packets of something unwholesome from one of the hideous erections on station platforms" (*English Prose Rhythm*, p. 371). I have opened a volume of the *History* at random, and I incontinently cite the first paragraph to hand:

The King watched these events with painful anxiety. He was weary of his crown. He had tried to do justice to both the contending parties; but justice would satisfy neither. The Tories hated him for protecting the Dissenters. The Whigs hated him for protecting the Tories. The amnesty seemed to be more remote than when, ten months before, he first recommended it from the

Clause-Length in English Prose

throne. The last campaign in Ireland had been disastrous. It might well be that the next campaign would be more disastrous still, etc. (*History*, ch. xv.)

This is, at all events, delightfully easy reading. But such "Tom's snipsnap" is more charming in a playful mood, with real word painting. For example:

He is the best of sapers. Pine-apple is great. She is indeed almost too transcendant—a delight, if not sinful, yet so like to sinning, that a really tender conscientised person would do well to pause—too ravishing for mortal taste, she woundeth and excoriateth the lips that approach her—like lovers' kisses, she biteth—she is a pleasure bordering on pain from the fierceness and insanity of her relish—but she stoppeth at the palate—she meddleth not with the appetite—and the coarsest hunger might barter her consistently for a mutton-chop.

Pig—let me speak in his praise—is no less provocative of the appetite than he is satisfactory to the criticalness of the censorious palate. The strong man may batten on him, and the weakling refuseth not his mild juices.

But this is merely a delightful bit of affectation. It is for the quick and excited style that the Asiatic manner is wanted. Here is another hackneyed bit, wonderful in its hurried rhythm, and ending with "tone-colour" of the best:

I was stared at, hooted at, grinned at, chattered at, by monkeys, by paroquets, by cockatoos. I ran into pagodas; and was fixed for centuries at the summit, or in secret rooms; I was the idol; I was the priest; I was worshipped; I was sacrificed. I fled from the wrath of Brahma through all the forests of Asia; Vishna hated me; Seeva laid wait for me. I came suddenly upon Isis and Osiris; I had done a deed, they said, which the ibis and the crocodile trembled at. I was buried for a thousand years, in stone coffins, with mummies and sphinxes, in narrow chambers at the heart of eternal pyramids. (*De Quincey, Opium Eater*, May, 1818.)

The rhythms here are obvious enough, only they are not fixed by strict laws like those of the Romans. But they are none the less studied, and iambics are carefully, if

Clause-Length in English Prose

instinctively, avoided. You cannot read the passage into blank verse. Notice the effective double creticus "crocodile trembled at," and the repeated creticus and spondee "years in stone coffins" and "mummies and sphinxes." These are two of the three favourite Latin endings, e.g., *respicit murmurans, altus excussit*.

This Asiatic style may be still more agitated, as in the similar dream, where we have half-clauses, and pairs of enumerations, and so forth:

... for the weight of twenty Atlantes was upon me, or the oppression of inexpiable guilt. "Deeper than ever plummet sounded," I lay inactive. Then, like a chorus, the passion deepened. Some greater interest was at stake; some mightier cause than ever yet the sword had pleaded or the trumpet had proclaimed. Then came sudden alarms, hurrying to and fro; trepidations of innumerable fugitives, I knew not whether from the good cause or the bad; darkness and lights; tempest and human faces; and, at last, with the sense that all was lost, female forms, and the features that were worth all the world to me, and but a moment allowed—and clasped hands, and heart-breaking partings, and then—everlasting farewells! and with a sigh, such as the caves of hell sighed when the incestuous mother uttered the abhorred name of death, the sound was reverberated—everlasting farewells! and again, and yet again reverberated—everlasting farewells! (De Quincey, *Opium Eater*, 1820.)

Notice the pæonic cadences, wholly English, quite unclassical: "oppression of inexpiable guilt," "pleaded or the trumpet had proclaimed," and the anapæstic "but a moment allowed," "everlasting farewells." The sound-painting is almost excessive.

Here is a passage where the Asiatic snippets are playful. It is from a former number of the DUBLIN REVIEW, and refers to Shelley:

... his playthings are those which the gods give their children. The universe is his box of toys. He dabbles his fingers in the day-fall. He is gold-dusty with tumbling amidst the stars. He makes bright mischief with the moon. The meteors muzzle their noses in his hand. He teazes into growling the kennelled Thunder, and

Clause-Length in English Prose

laughs at the shaking of its fiery chain. He dances in and out of the door of heaven: its floor is littered with his broken fancies. He runs wild over the field of ether. He chases the rolling world. He gets between the feet of the horses of the sun. He stands in the lap of patient Nature, and twines her loosened tresses after a hundred wilful fashions to see how she will look nicest in his song. . . . The lark that is the gossip of heaven, the winds that pluck the grey from the beards of the billows, the clouds that are snorted from the sea's broad nostril, all the elemental spirits of Nature, take from his verse perpetual incarnation and reincarnation, pass in a thousand glorious transmigrations through the radiant forms of his imagery. (Francis Thompson, *Shelley*.)

The last sentence bursts out into a swinging rhythm.

Asiatic brevity does not always use asyndeton between clauses—no *ands* and *buts*—and the omission of such particles is but chiefly for the purpose of clearness, or antithesis, or even hurry. A very fine example of different clause combinations is Cardinal Newman's description of Holy Mass in *Loss and Gain*. I will not quote it, but it is well worth analysing. The clauses are connected by epanaphora, which, being interpreted, signifies the beginning of successive clauses by the same word, in this case *Quickly . . . Quickly*.

It is possible, by too much sameness of clause length, to get an effect as if of verses. This is a defect to be avoided. It is only an almost unique experiment when Amyas in *Westward Ho!* talks in lines of equal measure, and Kingsley carefully tells us that "his voice was shaping itself into a song." Professor Saintsbury has printed the passage in verse-lines (pp. 403-5).

It is, as its author with perfect appositeness describes it, "prose shaped into song," but with constant, and it would seem deliberate, attention to the insertion, from short time to time, of words that slightly break the regularity of the rhythm, and remind you that, after all, it is not meant to be metre. In its avoidance of too definitely poetic diction, in its colloquial forms, and in this carefully adjusted "knapping" of the rhythm, it seems to me, though undoubtedly a dangerous, a successfully-brought-off experiment, and one well suited for the purposes of romance—occasionally.

Clause-Length in English Prose

But, as the late Professor Bain said of kissing, in a phrase which I may have quoted before (it is so delectable), "The occasion should be adequate, and the actuality rare."

But the short sentence does not naturally fall into recurrent rhythms. It has far more variety than the grave balance of standard prose can give. Instead of being consistently solid, measured or pompous, it is full of life and movement, and can be oratorical and persuasive, jocular and light, terrible, or mysterious, or enthusiastic, or incisive at will. It can only not be slow and sententious, and for this effect the long paragraph can easily be substituted.

But at the present day we do not much rejoice in long and perfect sentences. They bore us after a time. We tire of majestic prose. The swift style is easier for the reader as well as more pliable for the writer. That is the reason why one misses an analysis of it in Professor Saintsbury's works, and why one wishes for some of his learned and acute criticism to elucidate it. I have only drawn attention to a point on which one would like to know more.

JOHN CHAPMAN, O.S.B.

CIVIL LIBERTY IN PEACE AND WAR

THERE is no member of a modern State but feels, more or less consciously, the yoke of citizenship. In the stress of international competition, the needs of efficiency compel the civil authority to control more and more closely the interests of the individual for the promotion of the common good. This, of course, is no strange phenomenon, although, for this geographically favoured land, the motive has never before been so prominent. Up to late years this country, secure in its encircling seas, was able to go its own way at its own pace, without troubling about the growing activity and power of its neighbours. But our isolation, comfortable rather than splendid, had become a thing of the past even before the war. It is many years now since our present King, after his Canadian tour as Prince of Wales, bade England, not indeed to much purpose, to "wake up" and bestir herself in matters commercial. But a highly individualistic and liberty-loving people, long accustomed to self-reliance and the forms at least of self-government, does not easily realise that effort and sacrifice, over and above what personal advantage calls for, may be demanded by the general welfare. Whilst proud of its widespread Empire, it is slow to acknowledge and meet spontaneously the personal cost of its maintenance. Whatever State-intervention characterised the earlier part of the nineteenth century in England was brought about by domestic exigencies, not by the rivalry of other States threatening a long-established commercial supremacy. The rise of the German Empire, however, scientifically organised for commercial conquest, gave the British State further occasion for active control of private enterprise, occasion which, although by no means utilised to the full, served as a constant provocation to closer interference. On the other hand, the growing complexity of modern life and the awakening of many new interests have necessitated

Civil Liberty in Peace and War

more and more domestic legislation. On one account or the other, to promote prosperity at home and success abroad, the scope of civil authority has been steadily if gradually extending, so that, in comparison with the Britain of a century ago, we are a somewhat strictly ruled and inspected and regimented nation.

Yet, strange to say, the principle of the sovereignty of the people was never in theory so clearly or universally recognised either here or abroad.* The franchise has been constantly extended and representation made more real. The Crown has long since ceased to govern and the Aristocracy has lost nearly all its former political privileges. It would almost seem that the State, in thus becoming more democratic in form, had by a parallel process become more autocratic in reality. This need not be taken as an argument against popular government, for we have never had such a thing. It is a matter of ordinary historical knowledge that no true system of democracy has ever yet been established in this country. Whether, indeed, in the vast States of the modern world a real democracy is practicable is a matter of much dispute. At any rate, in his masterly study† of the development of the British polity, from the Revolution of 1688, which made the Crown the gift of Parliament, to the present day, Mr. Belloc shows conclusively that

* We now read with astonishment the First Article of the Treaty of Verona (November 22nd, 1822) as displaying a mentality which has all but vanished from the face of the earth, except perhaps in Prussia. It runs as follows: "The high contracting parties, being convinced that the system of representative government is as incompatible with monarchical principles as the maxim of the sovereignty of the people is with divine right, engage mutually and in the most solemn manner, to use all their efforts to put an end to the system of representative government, in whatever country it may exist in Europe, and to prevent its being introduced in those countries where it is not yet known." (Cf. *Memoirs of Prince Metternich*, London, 1881, vol. 3, pp. 655-659.) These were the views of European Governments not one hundred years ago. What wonder that the Congress of Vienna (1814) failed to produce European peace!

† *Lingard's History of England: Supplementary Volume*. By H. Belloc. 1915.

Civil Liberty in Peace and War

the aristocratic oligarchy then instituted in England has persisted in essence through many modifications down to our own time. Whether the nation ever could in any real sense govern itself, or not, the plain fact is that it does not do so. The electorate even now comprises only about one-sixth of the whole population. Owing to the party system, many of the electors in each constituency, it may be nearly a moiety, are unrepresented. The representatives have only the slightest chance of initiating legislation and can do very little to control the executive. Cabinet discussions are private, foreign diplomacy secret, the official Opposition is frequently consulted beforehand by the Government in order to facilitate the passing of its measures. Over its own followers, and more indirectly over those of the Opposition, the Government can exercise pressure in a variety of ways,* needless to specify. The only approach to an effective check upon its rule is public opinion, fostered, directed, and uttered by the newspaper press. But, as the press itself is dominated by the spirit of party and largely in the hands of a few irresponsible proprietors, this method is slow, clumsy, and uncertain at best.

The character of our present system of Government has been thus briefly indicated, not with a view to condemning it, although it is full of imperfections and anomalies, and grows more and more arbitrary every year, but in order to show that the multiform interference with personal liberty characteristic of the modern State is not the peculiar vice of any one system, and shows little likelihood of becoming less as popular government grows. There is no reason to think that a further extension of the franchise or a more perfect system of popular representation would result in less law-making. Rather the other way about. If the Socialist ideal were at all feasible, the people would doubtless have much more to

* For a detailed and acute, but almost wholly destructive, criticism of the "Party System," the reader will do well to consult the book with that title written by Messrs. Belloc and C. Chesterton.

Civil Liberty in Peace and War

say in the government than they have at present, yet the result would be, as we learn from the various Utopias that idealists have sketched, the almost complete destruction of the liberty of the individual. Accordingly, under whatever system of rule prevails, international competition and the promotion of order in a population of many conflicting interests will demand even in peace time a constant output of new laws.

But there is a more fundamental reason for the increase of that preventive, directive and coercive legislation to which the modern State is so prone, and that is the reason suggested by Tacitus in his famous phrase—in *corruptissima republica plurimae leges*. The spread of materialism, the decay of supernatural religion, the loss of the sense of sin and moral responsibility, have weakened very disastrously the power of conscience in the modern community, with the result that guidance and control has to be provided from outside for the benefit of those who have lost the light within. Moreover, as part of the same phenomenon and as contributing even more to the same result, must be reckoned the refusal on the part of the State to recognise the functions in the life of the community of the Church of Christ. Providence did not mean the State to stand and work alone. Just as grace is needed to give strength to fallen human nature, so God provided another organisation to supplement and support civil government, an organisation whose proper sphere is conscience and whose appeal is to the moral and spiritual nature of man. But the modern State has thrust the Church aside and gives her officially no recognition as a co-ordinate influence in ruling the minds of men. Where the relations between the two are not actually hostile, the State ignores the Church or treats her as a subordinate department. The result is that a vast amount of necessary work in training men to citizenship is left undone, and much which can only properly be accomplished by spiritual agency has devolved upon the civil authority, an institution which has neither the mission nor the equipment to undertake it. Hence much

Civil Liberty in Peace and War

futile legislation, much tinkering with the effects of evil instead of striking at the root, much confusion and irritation amongst the citizens. Given her due influence, the Church, which emancipated the slave in earlier times, would have done much more than Factory Acts and Trade Unions have been able to do to prevent the enslavement of the modern worker.

But, as elsewhere on the Continent, so also here in England the State itself has suppressed and silenced the Church. "Bluff Harry broke into the spence and turned the cowls adrift," and later generations were trained to applaud the robbery, yet nothing that Harry and his successors set up instead could replace what the spence and the cowls stood for. From the day when the Crown of England laid claim to spiritual jurisdiction and inaugurated a national religion cut off from the sources of Christian tradition, an all-important check on rampant individualism was removed. Since faith is always the inspirer of conduct, from licence to believe what one liked, which is the logical outcome of Protestantism, to licence to act as one pleased, the step is a short one. After the severance of the public conscience from the living voice of the Church, the old standards of morality lost their clearness and force, there was no effective appeal possible to common ethical conviction, spiritual sanctions became inoperative, religious uncertainty took the place of a clear-cut faith, sect after sect destroyed the external unity of the new Establishment, the energies of the Government were exhausted in seeking an impossible uniformity, and, once saddled with functions for which it had no aptitude, the State has ever since been handicapped even in the performance of its own proper duties. It has, in fact, undertaken the task of maintaining the civilisation which Christianity has built up, without the means which Christianity alone possesses. What wonder is it that it has constantly failed? After the Reformation the influence of the National Church, which was always Erastian in fact if not in principle, gradually declined: the old religion, under persecution, became almost extinct

Civil Liberty in Peace and War

and was quite powerless politically; dissent, which followed a true instinct in rejecting man-made authority over things spiritual, could do little, for all its evangelical spirit, to keep Christianity alive amongst the masses. Many of each succeeding generation grew up in practical heathendom, without religious instruction, without sacraments or other means of grace, without real internal religion.

The country, of course, was still officially Christian; the framework of a Church survived in the Establishment, and some of the old spirit lingered in the old devotional practices, at least before the Whig Revolution came to intensify its arid Protestantism, but then it was that, in the latter half of the eighteenth century, at the very lowest ebb of the Christian spirit in the nation, there supervened what is called "the industrial revolution," a movement which marked the definite change of England from a mainly agricultural to a mainly manufacturing country, and which, by completing the triumph of materialistic principles, threw upon the State the whole burden of coping with the injustice and inhumanity bred out of the new conditions. To oppose the de-Christianised and de-humanised doctrines framed by Adam Smith, Ricardo, Malthus, Mill, and others, whereby a philosophical justification was seemingly given to the avaricious instincts of man, there was no effectual Church teaching, because there was no Church at once qualified and free to teach. And even the action of the State in the common interest was paralysed at first, for this false philosophy advanced as a cardinal doctrine that the sole function of Government was to enforce contracts and to keep the peace between the various classes of its citizens, all struggling for a share in a limited and insufficient good.

The Bible, diligently read in Churches, proclaimed the brotherhood of man, the radical evil of covetousness, the sin of oppressing the poor, but over against these ideals were set the so-called "iron laws" of economics, even more immutable and inviolable than Divine truth—the "law" of supply and demand, of free contract and competition, of diminishing returns, and the rest of those

Civil Liberty in Peace and War

abstract figments,* which, in default of authoritative ethical teaching, succeeded in poisoning for generations all industrial relations in this country. Until midway through the nineteenth century this pernicious economic liberalism governed men's social conduct, for unfortunately those who had the power to remove abuses were precisely those who were interested in maintaining them. Not until the Constitution itself was reformed and the franchise made wider could the cause of the workers effectively gain a hearing, and from that time till this day the State has been endeavouring, without as yet fully recognising their source, to counteract and expel from economic practice those godless anti-social principles. At last we may hope they have been thoroughly discredited; in fact, the danger now is lest we should drift into the other extreme, and sacrifice, in an indiscriminate pursuit of fairness, economy and efficiency, much that is valuable in individualism.

In the consideration of conflict between the two great principles of liberty and law, both so helpful to human development, much confusion has resulted from inadequate or false notions of their nature. The claims of the individual and of the State alike have been exaggerated. We cannot therefore hope to discuss with any profit how far the State, whether in peace or war, has a right to circumscribe personal liberty, until we are quite clear about the nature and sphere of the civil authority on the one hand, and on the other about the indefeasible rights and natural limits of human freedom. Much of the appeal for State interference and the outcry against it arises from wrong ideas about both these subjects. Let us take the latter first.

* What misery doctrinaire theories, applied without common sense or common humanity, can cause is written large in the history of industrial conditions in this and other lands, particularly in the Reports of the Children's Employment Commission (1842 and 1843), and in the records of the Irish Famine some years later, when a pedantic Free Trade policy was responsible for the loss, by death and emigration, of over two million people. This is only part of the aftermath of the Reformation, "which made England great."

Civil Liberty in Peace and War

In the abstract, liberty is the unrestrained power of self-determination. This, in the case of a finite being like man, is clearly not to be found in its perfection. No creature has liberty, save in the measure conferred by its Creator, and God cannot transfer to us what is one of His own essential attributes. Our liberty, then, is conditioned by God's purposes, by the nature, end and circumstances He has provided for us. No creature is free from the obligation of obeying the laws of God whether in the material or spiritual order. He sets us within a fence of law of every sort, some of which indeed we can actually violate, but the sanction of which we cannot evade. Some immediate physical punishment follows the disregard of the "laws" of nature: for instance, that of gravitation. Disregard of the moral law, or sin, also carries with it, sooner or later, some form of penalty. No one is morally free to act who will be punished unless he acts in a particular way. Our freedom then, such as it is, is merely physical, and we are reminded of our various limitations many times a day. Our liberty of thought, for instance, is restrained both by the possession of exact knowledge, for about what we really know we cannot entertain doubt or conjecture, and also by the moral law, which forbids under penalty indulgence in thoughts that are evil. Our liberty of speech, again, is also conditioned by our knowledge, and by the necessity, if we wish to be understood, of being logical and grammatical; and, further, by the moral law against lying and speaking evil. Our liberty of action is still more limited—by our numerous physical incapacities, by many social bonds and conventions, by our own exigencies, by the manifold obligations of justice and charity, and by the precepts of lawful authority.

Here we must note that the actual capacity we feel of disregarding at will a number of these laws without immediate penalty is not a prerogative of liberty proper but rather a defect. This is to be insisted upon because the contrary error is so widespread. Although rational beings by nature, we are prone to act irrationally. All true

Civil Liberty in Peace and War

education is devoted to removing that defect. Before we are educated, we are "free" to think illogically, to write or speak ungrammatically, to act immorally, to disregard conditions of health and bodily safety and social welfare. By education we learn to submit to the laws of thought, the laws of language, the laws of morality, the laws of nature and social life. Our freedom, until we are thus educated, is merely that of a traveller who is astray on a moor in the dark. There is nothing to control our steps, yet any one may be disastrous. It is truth that comes to our rescue and frees us from the misguidance of error or ignorance. Guided we must be, and, in default of reason and conscience, then by passion, whim, external pressure, human respect, mere routine—all irrational and unworthy influences. Locke clearly recognised this and as clearly expressed it :—

Is it worth the name of freedom [he asks] to be at liberty to play the fool, and draw shame and misery on a man's self? If to break loose from the conduct of reason, and to want that restraint of examination, of judgment, which keeps us from choosing or doing the worst, be liberty, true liberty, madmen and fools are the only free men! And yet I think nobody would choose to be mad for the sake of such liberty but he that is mad already.*

Accordingly, to exercise our physical freedom of spurning the dictates of reason, which enjoin the observance of just law as always being to our true interest, is to accentuate a deficiency in our nature, to put ourselves in bondage to inferior non-rational influences, to lower ourselves to the level of the beasts,

Who own no lust because they have no law.

It is an illusory self-destructive freedom, one to be abolished as soon and as completely as possible. Liberty is surely then most perfect when it resembles most

* *On Human Understanding*, ii, 21.

Civil Liberty in Peace and War

closely that of God, and God is not free to do wrong or to act against His Nature. It is our business to remedy this our congenital defect; to safeguard our minds against ignorance and error by this fence of Truth, to brace our wills against evil by strong attachment to Good. The perfection of a rational nature lies in its power of doing what it ought, freely and spontaneously, and resisting all attractions which would fetter that power. Of one so perfected, St. Paul says the law is not made for him *; of one who is deliberately imperfect, thinking himself the freer, infallible Truth has proclaimed, "He that doeth sin is the slave of sin." † He yields to an influence which prompts him to an essentially irrational act.

As an instance of the prevalence of the fallacy which asserts that the physical power to follow inclination even to our own detriment is a constituent of true liberty, of liberty that is worth fighting in defence of, let us take a typical passage from a current magazine:

Heine cast loose from every bond that he could think of in his day. And Nietzsche thought of more. He cast loose from the bond of Christian ethics. There is no fuller record of *the ideal love of liberty* than is furnished by these heroes of Germany's culture. ‡

This author is not writing sarcastically. He is only uttering the common notion that part of the essence and expression of liberty is the power to violate morality in subservience to the promptings of pride and concupiscence. Such writers regard the Ten Commandments as shackles on the limbs of freedom, not as guide ropes provided by God to prevent human nature from falling, left or right, into the abyss. They do not see that the possession of freedom is not the same thing as its exercise, and that unless one has skill and strength to

* 1 Tim. i, 9.

† St. John, viii, 34.

‡ Max Eastman, in *The Forum*, January, 1916. Italics ours.

Civil Liberty in Peace and War

use it properly, its possession, like a dangerous tool in the hands of a child, will prove a curse rather than a blessing. Our conclusion, then, is that nothing that helps to the proper use of liberty, such as is a just law, can be said to derogate from it. "Freedom," says Ruskin, in an inspired passage,* "is only granted that Obedience may be more perfect." And in the following words he clearly distinguishes Liberty from that licence with which the unthinking confound it :

If by liberty you mean chastisement of the passions, discipline of the intellect, subjection of the will ; if you mean the fear of inflicting, the shame of committing, a wrong ; if you mean respect for all who are in authority, and consideration for all who are in dependence ; veneration for the good, mercy to the evil, sympathy with the weak ; if you mean watchfulness over all thoughts, temperance in all pleasures and perseverance in all toils ; if you mean in a word, that service which is defined in the Liturgy of the English Church to be perfect Freedom—why do you name this by the same word by which the luxurious mean licence and the reckless mean change ; by which the rogue means rapine and the fool equality ; by which the proud mean anarchy and the malignant mean violence ?

In other words, there is really no medium between serving God and serving Mammon. "Being made free from sin, ye were made servants to righteousness."*

It is now time to turn from the consideration of the real significance of human liberty to the consideration of that organisation which does so much to circumscribe it—the civil State. Here again, there prevails a wide diversity of view, both as regards the nature of the civil authority and the extent of its powers. On the one side is the extreme individualist who thinks government a necessary evil to be as much restricted as possible, on the other the thorough-going Socialist who thinks

* *Seven Lamps* : Obedience.

† Rom. vi, 18.

Civil Liberty in Peace and War

that the citizen was made for the State,* and may be wholly sacrificed to its interests, that, as all rights are State-created, so they may be abrogated by their creator. There are other intermediate positions partaking more or less of the defects of both extremes; Christian morality alone steers a safe course between them, defending the individual against State-encroachments and the State against over-individualism. We need not stay to enquire by what stages civil government, as we now find it, originated. It is enough to assert the indisputable fact that some form of stable government is necessary for human progress and well being; man cannot live a human life except in society, and no society can persist unless it is organised under a single ultimate or supreme authority. The Christian doctrine, enunciated by St. Paul under the Roman despotism in a well-known passage,† proclaims that all lawful authority derives its powers from the Creator, and acts, therefore, within its appointed limits, as His delegate. It matters not how the Government originally came into being, whether it be classed as legitimist or elective, or as an aristocracy or a democracy; provided its title is now just, its tenure stable, and its rule efficient, it becomes *ipso facto* the representative of God in its own order. This is opposed to many other theories, but notably to that of Rousseau, sophistical yet widely prevalent, by which Government is held to represent the collective will of the citizens and to derive the validity of its acts from their consent, as well as to the various absolutist views of regalists in favour of this or that dynasty as ruling by right divine. Rousseau's theory has infected the reasoning of many political writers outside the Church. It flatters human pride, for it makes man ultimately autonomous in the political

* To this extent "Prussianism" as expounded by Treitschke and others is in accord with extreme Socialism. Both deify the State and immolate the citizen upon its altar. Both are essentially atheistic.

† Rom. xiii. 1-7, "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers, for there is no power but from God," etc.

Civil Liberty in Peace and War

sphere; it lends itself easily to measures of revolt, for nothing more serious than human authority stands between the rebel and his desire. It has even coloured the political speculations of not a few Catholics. The following declaration by the late Father Hecker, for instance, seems to need some qualification to save it from Rousseauism:

All political authority in individuals is justly said to be derived, under God, from the consent of the collective people who are governed. The people, under God, associated in a body politic, are the source of the sovereign political power in the civil State.*

Others, too, by pushing to extremes the undoubted right of the people, *in a democracy*, to be consulted in regard to any considerable piece of legislation, and of the citizens everywhere to change a system of government which has shown itself wholly incapable, have practically taken up Rousseau's standpoint, to the confusion of political morality.

It is a false standpoint historically, for there never was such a "social contract," such a pooling of individual autonomies, as Rousseau imagined. It is false as a theory, for it makes a delegated authority superior to its source, and conveys to it powers which do not reside in its mandatories. It is also impracticable, for "the will of the people" in its last analysis is a mere abstraction and comes to represent only that fraction of the voters by which the majority exceeds the minority. No Government resting thus on sufferance could possess the stability necessary for efficiency.

How far the Government is bound to regulate its acts in accordance with the will of its citizens is another question, one the answer to which will vary according

* *The Church and the Age*, p. 81. Fr. Hecker probably means the phrase "under God" to save the orthodox Catholic doctrine, which, expressed theologically, asserts that the State is from God *antecedently* to the determination of any human will, whilst the particular form which it takes is from God *consequently* on the exercise of human volition.

Civil Liberty in Peace and War

to the actual constitution of the Government concerned. As in every case the efficacy (in distinction to the validity) of a law depends upon its being acceptable to the vast majority of those it affects, the prudent legislator will generally take measures to secure their consent beforehand. If again, in any particular case, the constitution is so framed as to make the will of the majority expressed in due form the ultimate determinant of validity, then, of course, the Government must rule in accordance with that constitution. We may say in general terms that a form of government which admits those of its citizens who are capable of legislating intelligently and justly to the widest possible share in legislation most nearly approaches the ideal. As complete self-government is the ideal for the individual, so it is for the community. External law is never necessary except in default of knowledge, wisdom, and moral integrity. Self-imposed law is an acknowledgment of those defects and of a desire to make them good. But Rousseau's doctrine springs wholly from pride and self-sufficiency and a desire to assert an unreal independence.

Happily, of recent years, we have had repeated declarations from the Holy See emphasising the true doctrine and rejecting the false. The pronouncements of Leo XIII. on Civil Government receive additional weight and authority from being embodied by Pius X. in the document in which he condemned the extravagancies of the French Catholic democratic association, called *Le Sillon*. Pope Pius quotes from Leo's Encyclical *Diuturnum illud* * the following pregnant passages :

Moderns, in great numbers, following in the footsteps of the self-styled philosophers of last century, maintain that all power comes from the people, that, therefore, those who exercise power in the State do not exercise it as their own but as delegated to them by the people, and on condition that it may be revoked

* See, for this passage and others as pertinent, *The Pope and the People*. C.T.S. 1s. net.

Civil Liberty in Peace and War

by the will of the people from whom they hold it. Quite the contrary is the Catholic view, which holds that the right to command comes from God as from its natural and necessary source.

Thus, the civil government is the representative of God in the secular order, but, as the Encyclical goes on to explain, it is within the prerogative of the citizens to choose what form of government shall be so endowed by the Divine Founder of human society. Nor is it wholly correct to say that God gives the people the authority which they subsequently hand over to their rulers. The Pope says :—

It is important here to notice that those who are to preside over the commonwealth may in certain cases be chosen by the will and judgment of the multitude : there is nothing in Catholic teaching at all contrary to this. But the effect of their choice is to mark out what person shall hold the powers of government, not to confer those powers upon him. The right to rule is not delegated, but a person is appointed to receive that right.

It may be said that there is little practical difference in the result : if the people can designate the recipient of God-given authority, and also determine the period and other conditions of his holding it, they may to all intents and purposes be said to confer it. But reflection will show that the distinction is important in order effectually to safeguard human dignity. It is no derogation from our essential worth that we should be subject to God, but it may well be a degradation that we should be ruled by men like ourselves, with the mere modicum of selection and consent involved in the union of our wills with those of millions of our fellows. Moreover, it is just as contrary to right reason that supreme power should ultimately reside in the general body of the citizens, as that it should be the absolute possession of some particular dynasty. Despotism is despotism wherever lodged. Only the Christian doctrine combines and harmonises the rival claims of authority and liberty. Authority comes from

Civil Liberty in Peace and War

God and God alone has the right to set limits to human freedom. He does so in the spiritual order by instituting an infallible teaching Church, and, in the other, by giving authority to the civil State.

That being well understood, Catholic teaching goes on to attack the very essence of "Prussianism" and Socialism, emphatically insisting that civil authority is given to the rulers of a State, not for their own benefit nor for that of the State in the abstract, but for the good of the individual citizens. The ruler, indeed, is not the servant of the people in the sense that he cannot act save at their instance; nevertheless, his chief *raison d'être* is to promote their interests. He serves them in this way in virtue of his commission from God. Hence the first of the checks on his power. As God has the chief claim on the allegiance of His creatures, no act of the State can lawfully interfere with the citizen's religious obligations, and it must respect the rights of that institution which God has established to teach His will to men.* In fact, no State-law which is not expressly or constructively in accord with the will of God has any binding power at all. As we have seen, no one but God in the last analysis has a right to the submission of any human will. To that extent, at any rate, all men are born equal.

Moreover, since God is the author of the family as well as of the civil State, man as member of a family has another set of rights and duties which are not included in citizenship and with which citizenship should not interfere. This provides a second limit to the powers of the State. It may not legislate, for instance, in such a way as to injure the institution of marriage or prevent the due exercise of parental rights. Marriage, certainly, has a civil aspect and the civil power is competent to regulate the conditions of the contract and to determine the legal effects, etc., of union or separation. But beyond that it

* It is not the purpose of this essay to discuss the relative powers of Church and State and the limitations of their respective prerogatives. It may, however, be pointed out that the Church is the ultimate guardian of the rights of conscience against the encroachments of "Caesarism."

Civil Liberty in Peace and War

may not go. Its attempt to dissolve the bond of marriage is *ultra vires* : a usurpation of a right which God has denied even to His Church. Moreover, the regulation of marriage in accordance with the *full* Eugenist programme would equally transcend its powers.* And it is similarly debarred from ignoring the functions of the parents in educating their children.

These two provinces, then, of the supernatural and the natural orders respectively, are closed to the direct operation of the State. Its sole function in their regard is to secure the conditions in which the individual may therein enjoy his rights and perform his duties.

But now we can turn to the region wherein the civil authority has unimpeded sway and wherein it has plenty of scope for beneficent activity. The State is the community organised for political stability and social welfare. Under modern conditions, so complex, so wide-reaching, so changeful, incessant watchfulness and exertion are incumbent on those who superintend the fortunes of the nation, in order to secure the chief end of government, *i.e.*, the good of the governed. It is customary to divide the proper functions of government into those that are primary and those that are secondary, and theorists, too, are divided by the emphasis they lay on the one or the other of these two classes. The primary functions of the State comprise the protection of the general rights of its citizens from aggression, whether domestic or foreign. Such rights are the right to life, health, morality, education, reputation ; the right to make contracts and join in honest associations ; the right, moreover, to found a family and to acquire and possess what is necessary for its maintenance. Some social economists hold that with the safeguarding of these rights the interference of the State

* This is a point of extreme importance in view of the activities of many non-Catholic social reformers who are pressing upon the State in the interests of social hygiene measures of various kinds affecting the primary rights of the individual. The recent Report of the Commission on Venereal Diseases contains several recommendations which no Catholic could endorse. But this cannot be discussed here.

Civil Liberty in Peace and War

should cease, being under the impression that their strict observance would remove most social abuses. Others with much more reason argue that, as the State exists to promote temporal prosperity, it should take the initiative in many directions not open to private enterprise, and do what it can by legislation to restrain the evils of open competition and a selfish pursuit of individual interest. Whatever may be said in the abstract against this interference, it is plain that the modern State, for reasons already assigned, is practically committed to it, and the only question is : how far may it go in the general interest without unduly infringing personal liberty ? To what extent may the obligations of citizenship override the claims of the individual and the member of a family ?

The question is easily answered in the abstract. To secure the end of the State, the welfare, security, honour, independence of its citizens—all tangible things which directly benefit each one of them—the State may set aside all personal interests which do not belong to the categories already described. To that extent the State is superior to the individual, and it may also in extreme cases command the citizen to sacrifice his property and even to expose his life in its defence. On the other hand, as we have seen, it may not enter the domain of conscience and stand between the citizen and his duty to God. It cannot, for any temporal advantage whatsoever, compel him to injustice or sin of any sort. To that very considerable extent the individual is superior to the State.

But difficulties begin when we approach the matter in the concrete. We cannot proceed by induction. The civil Governments of the world are so variously constituted and developed, and have so commonly in regard to religion exceeded their proper functions that it would be vain to attempt to gather from what they actually do what they precisely ought to do. So for a standard we have to fall back upon whatever theory of State powers and duties can best be constructed from a careful analysis of the object of the State. It is important not to exaggerate that object or else we shall ascribe too much to the civil

Civil Liberty in Peace and War

power. Catholic theologians, following Suarez, point out that the civil authority has in view only the welfare of the community *in this world*, and what makes for the good of the citizens as such : that is, order, peace, freedom from oppression, sufficient livelihood, etc. This involves the suppression and punishment only of such moral delinquencies as frustrate or imperil these natural goods. The goodness or badness of the citizen is no concern of the State, except in so far as his moral condition expressed in his outward behaviour affects his status as member of the community. It may not even enforce the Divine law, except as a means of temporal welfare. The State, in other words, takes no cognizance of *sin* but only of *crime*. It punishes blasphemy as an offence against public decency, not as an outrage against God. It is true that good men make the best citizens, yet the State cares only for their goodness as citizens, not as men. To aim at furthering moral excellence as such is the function of the Church.

Of course, since seeking the Kingdom of God and His justice results in all manner of temporal advantage as well, civil law in its own sphere will often aid the development of virtue. It cannot but determine in many cases the application of the divine law, as when it prohibits theft and murder. Yet there is a region peculiar to itself, the region of positive law wherein questions of morality do not directly enter. Now, it is characteristic of positive laws that they really do invade the sphere of moral liberty and lessen it, which the divine law never does. Hence the subject has a right to scrutinise jealously all enactments of the sort and to examine their justification, for they take away from him a measure of liberty which was previously his. A civil law which is the re-enactment of a divine law, such as the prohibition of trading on Sunday, enjoys the same sanction as the divine ; it only adds physical penalties to the moral constraint already existing. But a law made merely to promote some temporal good, such as the common injunction "Keep off the grass," does not of itself make for the perfection of a

Civil Liberty in Peace and War

rational nature, and so depends for its justification on the validity of its purpose and its own capability of promoting it. "Keep off the grass" may be a reasonable command in a suburban park; it would be a silly piece of interference on the prairie. However, whatever trouble or annoyance positive laws cause the individual, he must submit in the common interest. It is part of the price he pays for the benefit of living in society.

Obedience, moreover, to positive law is a duty of conscience, assuming that the enactments are within the competence of the State, but, as such laws are generally "penal"—*i.e.* offer the alternatives of submission or of undergoing the penalty of resistance—a man is free to choose the risk of the latter. Law is defined to be "a regulation according to reason promulgated by the head of a community for the common welfare." Regulations therefore which are against reason or conscience, or which have not been authentically made known, or which have not been framed by the supreme authority, or which are exclusively for the interests of an individual or a class, do not merit the name nor carry the obligation of laws.

As tending to diminish liberty, lessen initiative, induce routine, hamper enterprise, the citizen, as we have said, has a right to demand that positive law should come to him recommended by its reasonableness and the importance of the end it aims at securing. Nor, in view of the advantages of individual freedom to the State itself, should the latter be too anxious to secure uniformity of procedure or economy of effort at the expense of those higher qualities. In trying to determine in detail the extent of civil authority, leaving aside the abstract assertions that the State can do all that is necessary to maintain itself and secure its *raison d'être* but must not do more, we can only say that its action must vary according to the actual needs and condition of the body politic of which it is the head, that the body politic must be considered as it is and not as it should be; that, as we have indicated above, in this country abnormal conditions prevail because the Church embodying the tradition of Christianity does

Civil Liberty in Peace and War

not occupy her providential place ; that legislation must be largely experimental and should seek the support of public opinion.* This latter factor from the practical point of view is of the utmost importance, and equally important, of course, is the education of public opinion. It is only because the public conscience is so imperfectly enlightened, and because consequently it is very difficult to obtain practical unanimity on any great issue, that in a democracy the Government has secured such large powers of initiative. The extent to which the public will stand State-intervention in the positive order becomes practically its only check. We cannot complain if, in view of the disorganised condition of industrial relations and the various other diseases of the body politic, the State should extend its energies further and further, until no great injustice remains unremedied and no unnecessary obstacle to progress is unremoved. And whatever the State may do in peace time for internal order and prosperity abroad, its range of action is and must be indefinitely increased by the occasion of a war such as the present. A short summary of the normal interferences of the State will best illustrate what the abnormal may be.

(1) The State may tax—*i.e.*, take, directly or indirectly, so much of the wealth of its citizens as is necessary to carry on public business. To determine fairly the incidence of taxation is one of the most difficult problems of government, so various are the needs and conditions of the citizens. Ill-regulated taxation may discourage thrift, may penalise marriage, may lower the birth-rate, may cripple enterprise, and the money raised may be wastefully or even wrongly expended ; still, the right to tax is unassailable. And, as a rule, it is fair that the more wealthy, reckoning their wealth less the lawful charges upon it, should be more heavily taxed, because

* Not, of course, to the real detriment of the interests of the minority. In 1906, no doubt, the prevalent public opinion of *the moment* was in favour of the attempted settlement of the Education question on "undenominational" lines, but a vigorous agitation by Catholics led to more enlightened, if not yet wholly just, measures.

Civil Liberty in Peace and War

they benefit more by the protection of the State. Were the need of the State to become extreme, as might happen in war time, it might justly appropriate from the wholly superfluous means of its richer citizens what would supply its need; the alternative to such partial appropriation being wholesale confiscation by the victorious enemy. That heavier taxes should fall on the net profits of such industries as have greatly increased because of the national misfortune of war appeals at once to the moral sense as wholly just. This right of taxation must, of course, be exercised in accordance with the Constitution, and with the assent of the electorate as represented in Parliament.

(2) The State may exact certain personal services connected with the administration of justice, the most usual of which is service on the bench of magistrates, on juries and in the witness-box.

(3) The State may punish delinquent citizens with statutory penalties in proportion to their offences, even to the extent of depriving them of life.

(4) The State may in the general interest regulate the charters of association and the conditions of contracts, in accordance with equity.

(5) In view of the unfortunately hostile relations between labour and capital, the State must interfere to prevent injustice to either side, but especially to protect the weak from the stress of inhuman competition and inadequate reward. The industrial unrest, abnormal even in peace time, will always demand legislation.

(6) In default of the parental care which the very poor have not the means or opportunity to exercise, the State must see, either by its own efforts or by using voluntary aid, that their children do not grow up uneducated or undeveloped.

(7) Because organised wickedness is so prevalent to the detriment of public morality, the State must be vigilant in suppressing the social evil, and all offences against public decency in places of entertainment, books, pictures, etc.

Civil Liberty in Peace and War

(8) So long as the workers have no opportunity to make provision for sickness or old age, the State may rightly lay the burden of their maintenance upon the community which tolerates these iniquitous social conditions.

(9) In the family and all other associations, such as schools, asylums, hospitals, etc., wherein its subjects are under private control, the State should exercise such a degree of superintendence as may be needed to prevent abuses.

(10) Since many social practices lawful in themselves easily lend themselves to abuse, the State is obliged in the public interest to do what it can to keep them in check. Prominent amongst these practices are betting, gambling, and the drinking of strong liquor, by the abuse of which national prosperity is seriously impaired. Hence much legislation with the object of lessening the incidence of temptation on those less fitted to sustain it. State needs may justify the absolute prohibition of strong drink locally or temporarily, or even, when the abuse is widespread, universally.

(11) One of the chief cares of the State is the safeguarding of public health. It should, therefore, prevent by legislation the spread of practices such as adulteration, or the growth of conditions, such as slums, which are a notable cause of disease. No citizen has a right so to neglect his health that he becomes a burden or a nuisance to society. In the case of those who, again through the abnormal state of our civilisation, cannot maintain themselves in health or even in existence the State must make provision at the expense, if necessary, of the community. But the utmost care should be taken not to interfere except when the need is really serious. Even as it is, the Church by means of her active Orders of Charity does a great deal to remedy these social evils.

(12) Finally, when the incidence of a war or mere geographical situation in the midst of hostile and threatening neighbours endangers its existence, the State may summon to its defence its male population of fighting age

Civil Liberty in Peace and War

in whatever proportion may be necessary. The first duty of a citizen in importance, though it may be the last he is called on to undertake, is to defend, by person and means, his country from unjust aggression. In the ideal State this duty would be performed spontaneously from a clear sense of moral obligation. Because, however, of the possible backwardness of some, the State is justified, granting the emergency, in making military service compulsory.

These are some of the categories—financial, judicial, industrial, penal, social, preventive, defensive—which lie well within the ambit of State action. It will be noticed that much legislation is necessitated by the presence in the community of a lawless, unconscientious element wholly anti-social in its action. The upright and law-abiding must put up with a great deal of expense and a great variety of restrictions, because of the criminal tendencies of a minority and the weakness and lethargy of a multitude of the citizens. As long as public opinion does not effectively condemn the selfish pursuit of riches and pleasure; as long as those who live in idleness and luxury are considered objects of envy and not of reprobation; as long as man may treat his fellow-man, unrebuked by law, as a mere means of making money, so long will the State, in self-protection, be compelled to apply the palliative of a multitude of regulations aimed at counter-acting the results of this un-Christian individualism.

And as for the future, it would seem that we must look to an ever-increasing activity on the part of the civil authority. The war has given occasion for enormous advances in social legislation, many of which will have permanent effects. The crying needs of unity, efficiency, speed and economy in this crisis have reconciled citizens to much temporary loss of freedom. A sumptuary measure like the Anti-Treating Act would have been unthinkable in pre-war times. The need of reconstruction when the crisis is past will further extend the range of State intervention. The days of *laissez-faire*, as we have said, have gone for ever. What we have rather to

Civil Liberty in Peace and War

dread is such a growth of social legislation, in the name of those virtues wherein we have been proved lacking, that our old ideals of self-reliance, enterprise, freedom of action, will be stifled under the burden. We are not yet free from the menace of "industrial conscription" and other features of the Servile State. In vain shall we have conquered Germany if we succumb to the social ideals of that over-drilled Empire. Already, under the Defence of the Realm (Consolidation) Act, 1914, administrative action has extended far beyond the control of the Legislature. The Government has been given wide powers to legislate by simple Proclamation.* Moreover, the very corner-stone of British liberty—the *Habeas Corpus* Act—seems to have been practically suspended, and the Courts have decided (*Rex v. Halliday*) that the Government can imprison subjects without trial. A letter in to-day's *Times* (March 2nd) declares that 33 persons, 17 of British birth and 16 who are naturalised, are at present in gaol at the discretion of the Home Secretary and out of the protection of the law courts. We are not condemning or even criticising these startling innovations,† but merely indicating what the State can do under war conditions to circumscribe civil freedom, and what agencies are at work to purchase national effectiveness at the cost of national tradition.

The conclusion to which these reflections desire to point is that the only safeguard against the dangers of a species of State Absolutism is insistence upon the social principles of Christianity. Our religion is emphatic in inculcating the duty of rendering to Cæsar, without compulsion and without reluctance, the things that really are Cæsar's. If that is done, Cæsar is the less likely to demand what is not his. Catholics, therefore, should not shirk social service, should be distinguished for their

* The odious use of administrative action made by the late Government to penalise denominational schools indicates the dangers of this practice.

† "Startling innovations" here in England. Ireland has long been familiar with both these abnormal exercises of authority.

Civil Liberty in Peace and War

humane dealings with their employees and dependents, should dissociate themselves from the class of the "idle rich," who grasp at the privileges and shun the responsibilities of wealth. They should use their influence to further the spread of Christian ideas in the approaching readjustment of our national life, especially in that wide and troubled world of industry where there is so much that is amiss. The war has shown the bankruptcy of material civilisation. It is now that Christianity, by the aid of her devoted children, has a chance of recovering her own

J. KEATING, S.J.

SOME RECENT BOOKS

¶ Under this heading will be noticed a limited number of books to which the Editor is unable to devote one of the longer articles, but desires, for one reason or another, to call attention.

SIR MARTIN CONWAY, equally well known as a connoisseur of art and an ardent explorer of mountain ranges, has written, in *The Crowd in Peace and War* (Longmans. Pp. 332. 6s. net.) a very fresh and stimulating book upon a very well-worn theme. This feat he has accomplished, partly by the aid of a cultivated style and the employment of remarkable powers of observation and analysis, and partly, it must be owned, by reason of his ignoring the established results of previous labourers in the same field and clothing his own investigations in unfamiliar phraseology. We know nothing of the author's religion, of his notion of ultimate realities, of the kind of cosmos he inhabits, save what can be gathered from a perusal of his book, but we venture to think, judging from that source, that he is a rationalist of the Frazer school, unhampered, as he would claim, by dogmatic faith in a revelation or a Church, and relying on the unaided human reason to solve the problems he confronts. Consequently in Catholic opinion his work, however able, will suffer from incurable defects, for he does not consider the whole of the data and must misinterpret much that he does consider. That we are justified in calling his subject a well-worn one will be evident when we reflect that the action of social life on individual character has been under the observation of philosophers since the dawn of history, that the tendency of man, *animal rationale* though he be, to avoid when he can the trouble of thinking has engaged the satirist from the beginning, that human beings are so notoriously gregarious that to be egregious, like the jay in peacock's feathers, is a matter of reproach, that the natural procedure for those who have a common purpose is to unite together for its furtherance, that the feelings of a mob once aroused have always been known to grow by mere

Some Recent Books

association far stronger than their original cause could warrant.

These are the phenomena upon which Sir Martin philosophizes with all the zest of a pioneer, although they have always figured amongst the ordinary subjects of the psychologist. His treatment, as we said, is stimulating because he illustrates his principles by many modern instances, and expounds them in considerable detail, though at the cost of some repetition. But the Catholic psychologist will be stimulated, not by the presentment of new aspects of truth, but by the dexterous attempts of old errors to hide under new disguises. The very opening sentence of the volume calls for correction. "Man," we read, "has never decided whether to be a gregarious animal or not." We reply that the matter is not left to man's choice; he is essentially gregarious. There are, or have been, men who have spent part of their lives in solitude for certain spiritual purposes, but the lives they led by divine assistance were supra-human. The solitary is something abnormal—*ἡ θηπλιον ἡ θεός*. A certain amount of human intercourse is necessary for the development of human nature. Yet no one may lawfully merge his individuality in society. Each human being, separately created, is personally responsible to his Creator. We are, therefore, both individual and gregarious.

But, perhaps, the most radical error in Sir Martin Conway's philosophy is his endowment of "the crowd" with an entity distinct from those of the items that compose it and his assertion that this entity, which is a mere *ens rationis* or mental figment, is non-rational and non-moral, "a sort of beast." Here, in fact, we have a double error. The name "crowd" is employed to mean any aggregation of human beings, from the nation widely extended in space and time to the chance group under the sway of a mob-orator. This would be but a slight inconvenience, if with the name the characteristics of the mob had not been transferred to the highly-organized self-conscious association. Because the former *after its passions have*

The Crowd

been aroused is indeed no longer capable of reasoning and often acts wantonly and wildly, the author would have us consider that all association implies a surrender of a measure of self-guidance. Whereas into many associations emotion never enters at all; their bond is wholly intellectual. And the more disciplined and better-organized a "crowd" is, the less does mere emotion affect it. It attracts individuals by offering them a readier means of accomplishing some purpose. Their mental attitude is not then first determined by their joining it, although it may become more firm in consequence. One does not become a Tory by frequenting the Carlton, but one frequents the Carlton because one is a Tory. It is, of course, true that, once a member of a club, or a profession, or a long-established school, or a business firm, or a regiment, one comes under the influence of strong traditions which the lazy-minded are likely to accept with the minimum of examination, but even so one still preserves much of one's powers of self-determination. Men do not become less rational because of their organized groupings.

And even in the case of a mob properly so-called emotion is born in intellectual conviction. Most of the crowd which gathers to break the windows of an unpopular citizen have intelligible grounds for thinking him unpopular. Mark Antony did not excite the passions of the Romans until he had skilfully persuaded them that Caesar had been their benefactor and had been unjustly treated. Then the mob did become a beast and killed a man merely because of his name. When passion in a crowd is at its height those that then join it do surrender their self-control and engage in whatever mischief is afoot.

The second error is graver because of its logical results. If man in association becomes non-moral as well as non-rational, then we have the abomination, called from its chief adherents "Prussianism" but common in all non-Christian schools of thought, the abominable theory that the law of God which binds the individual does not affect the group, or that ordinary morality is in some way modified when applied to collective human action. We

Some Recent Books

know that the group styled the German State holds itself above morality, and seeks in this fact the justification for the outrages it perpetrates. Our author's theory would readily countenance this practical atheism.

It will be easily understood that Sir Martin's application of his principles to religion and morality abounds with false and defective results. It would be tedious to discuss them in detail. When a thinker asks, "Is the relation of man to God a personal or a collective relation? or does it partake of both characters, and, if so, in what degrees?" and then goes on to say, "These are questions so obvious and so important that a large literature might be expected to exist concerning them, and *yet I am not aware that they have received any formal consideration whatever*,"* he puts himself wholly out of court as a serious philosopher and cannot, at any rate, claim the attention of Christians. By ignoring the vast literature of Christian asceticism, which, from St. Paul's Epistles down to the latest meditation-book, is formally concerned with the personal relations between God and man, by ignoring the mighty structure of Catholic theology which deals exclusively with the belief and conduct of mankind organized as members of God's Church, he proclaims himself a mere dabbler in a great subject. He peers about with a rushlight in a region which he styles "vague, difficult, and profoundly important," but which lies all the while in the full blaze of Christian tradition, measured and mapped out by God's own authentic utterances and further elucidated by the voice of His Church.

The book may do some service by calling attention to the non-intellectual basis of many of our actions—things done through routine, habit, and fashion—but that morality is not likely to be served by the author's advocacy of individualism is clear from many passages, notably by his implicit condonation of free love† and his whole attitude towards marriage.

J. K.

* p. 213. Italics ours.

† Pp. 204-5.

Dieu ; Son Existence

THE condemnation of Modernism has led to the production of a number of works in which the old traditional Philosophy of the Schools has been vindicated, and the insidious and destructive character of the Phenomenalist and the extreme Idealist positions has been with minute care and lucidity exposed. The spread of error has ever been the occasion of a deeper study of the truth ; the appearance of Modernism has proved to be no exception to this rule, for it has led to a more thorough, a more practical study of the Scholastic Philosophy, to a more profound and painstaking defence of its fundamental principles, and to a closer touch with present day problems in its exposition. A notable addition to this class of literature has appeared in a work by Père Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P., Professor of Theology at the Collegio Angelico in Rome, entitled *Dieu ; Son Existence et Sa Nature. Solution Thomiste des Antinomies Agnostiques*. (Paris, Beauchesne. pp. 770, 10 francs). The book is divided into two parts ; the first being devoted to the proofs of God's existence ; while in the second, God's nature and attributes are considered.

The great characteristics of the learned Dominican's treatise are its thoroughness, and the lucid way in which the various points are set forth, the arguments expounded and their precise bearing and force presented to the reader. Like the wise householder in the gospel, he produces from the treasures of the Aristotelian and Thomistic Philosophy new things and old ; examining its teaching in the light of the current errors of the day and showing therein the antidote to the dangers of a false philosophy.

The fullness of the author's treatment of his subject and the wide field covered in his work can best be seen by a brief analysis of the first part of the book. This is divided into three chapters, in the first of which he studies the teaching of the Vatican Council concerning the power of Reason to demonstrate from creatures the existence of God, and then considers the purport and authority of the passages in the Anti-Modernist Oath

Some Recent Books

which refer to that subject. In his second chapter he considers the nature of the demonstration involved in the proofs for God's existence : deals with objections urged by Agnostics, both Empirical and Idealist, against the power to demonstrate God's existence ; and then proceeds to establish the ontological and transcendental value of the First Notions and the First Principles. In his third chapter he vindicates the validity of the five great arguments given by St. Thomas to prove God's existence. This third chapter is a model of painstaking accuracy and clearness. Before entering on the detailed examination of the arguments, he is careful to point out their character and purport ; he shows how all other proofs may be reduced to these five, and their applicability to all classes of being, corporeal and spiritual ; he then gives the reasons for the order in which the Master sets them forth, and finally notes the precise point which they do prove (a matter too often forgotten), and their relation to each other. In the second part of the work one finds the difficulties so familiar to students carefully and, indeed, minutely dealt with from the Thomistic standpoint.

This work cannot be too highly praised. Its perusal affords a mental discipline of no mean order, and a stimulus to hard and conscientious thinking. There is no evading of difficulties, no airy waving aside of objections ; but each is fearlessly stated, has justice done to it and is patiently examined. Its 770 closely reasoned pages demand indeed no slight expenditure of time and labour, but time and labour will be well expended, for the result will be to deepen one's respect for the old traditional Philosophy which Leo XIII., following in the steps of his predecessors, so warmly commended.

E. K.

THE latest volume of the Cambridge Patristic Texts is the *Commonitorium of Vincentius of Lerins*, edited by Reginald Stewart Moxon, B.D., Headmaster of Lincoln School (University Press. Pp. lxxxviii, 156. 9s. net).

Commonitorium of Vincentius

It is a very typical example of the work of the Cambridge Divinity School of the present day, where theology consists mainly of textual criticism, and lectures dealing directly with Christian doctrine are excluded of set purpose. Mr. Moxon has done his work well, as far as we can judge, where the actual text of the *Commonitorium* is concerned. He has collated the four existing MSS. of the work, all of which are at the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris, and has also collated the *editio princeps* of 1528, which was based upon a fifth MS. now lost. He gives us an excellent little dissertation on the Latinity of the treatise and supplies a very complete bibliography. For all this work we are grateful; and it is all done with Cambridge thoroughness. But when he comes to consider the theological side of the treatise, to estimate the doctrinal position of its author, and most of all in his controversial remarks against present-day Catholicism, we cannot help feeling that Mr. Moxon is insufficiently equipped for the task he has undertaken. Not much can be expected in this field from an author who can write as follows:—

It is obvious that even in those days [the seventeenth century] there was considerable difficulty in reconciling many points of Roman Catholic doctrine with the canon of Vincentius. Various methods were resorted to. One was the appeal to what is called the "Disciplina arcani," that is to instructions given by Christ to the Apostles during the forty days between His Resurrection and Ascension. According to this theory . . . Christ gave His Apostles much minute direction as to the government of the Church which . . . was not intended to be divulged openly but only to be handed on from one ruler of Christ's Church to another, being confined to the knowledge of those in authority and dispensed gradually according as circumstances might demand.

The Cambridge Press ought not to have printed, nor Canon Mason to have edited rubbish of this kind. This whole chapter of the Introduction ought to be rewritten when the author has acquired a sounder knowledge of his subjects.

Some Recent Books

As he is editing the original text Mr. Moxon naturally quotes the Vincentian canon in its proper form, *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus*. The order is important and intentional. For Vincent the primary test of Catholic doctrine was the consent of the living Church, "*quod ubique*." Is it held everywhere in the Church at the present time? Only in the second place and as additional tests where this first one fails to give a decisive answer does he appeal to antiquity "*quod semper*," and to the consent of the Fathers "*quod ab omnibus*." Ecumenical consent in the existing Church is the primary test and the one which he develops at greatest length. But here we have a curious psychological effect. The Tractarian writers, whose appeal was solely to antiquity against the living voice of the Church, seized on the maxim with avidity and, doubtless quite unconsciously, since for them "*quod semper*" was the part that appealed, put those words in the first place and always quoted it as *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*. It is in this form that Newman quotes it again and again in the *Development*, and in this form it is habitually quoted by Anglicans to this day, always, apparently, in complete unconsciousness that they are very seriously misrepresenting their author.

That St. Vincent was Semipelagian in tendency cannot be denied, nor that the *Commonitorium* was written covertly to oppose St. Augustine and to put forward Semipelagian views. A better defence for his action is to be found in the fact that when he wrote the Church had not yet spoken and the question was so far still open, than in Mr. Moxon's statement that Semipelagianism "does not to-day meet with very serious condemnation." Outside of Anglicanism Semipelagianism remains to-day, as it has done ever since the decrees of the Second Synod of Orange were solemnly confirmed by Boniface II in 560, and as it will as long as the world lasts, a heresy formally placed under the anathema of the Church.

A. B.

Forerunners of Christianity

MR. F. LEGGE, who writes on *Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity*, a collection of "Studies in religious history from 330 B.C. to 330 A.D.," roughly, the triumph of Alexander to the death of Constantine (Cambridge, The University Press, 2 vols., pp. lxi, 202; ix, 425, 25s. net), desires to bring before the public certain documents of great importance for the understanding of the growth and development of the Christian religion. We may say at once that it appears to us quite untrue to say that this sort of material is "all practically unknown save to scholars." Surely we have been deluged, during the last decade, with popular literature upon this very subject. The picture which Mr. Legge proposes of the average modern opinion as to the birth and earlier periods of Christianity, appears to us to be that, perhaps, of non-Catholics, especially low-churchmen, some considerable time ago. We do not think it is that of our average contemporary fellow-Christian, other than Catholic, and it is not, of course, and probably never has been, that of Catholic philosophy, to which the notion of development has always been familiar. Though it may not have taken the form of Darwin's biological hypothesis, and still less, of the theory inaccurately supposed to be Darwin's, that does not interfere with the fact that Catholics, from St. Paul onwards, have had philosophy of religious development, which too many students have found it easier to ignore. It remains that, not only in learned centres, such as those to which Mr. Legge alludes, and in Catholic seminaries or universities, of which (despite a quite recognisable endeavour to be fair, and a constant and successful courtesy) we cannot think he knows more than very little, the material with which he deals has been, rather indiscriminately in fact, flung forth for the inquisitive to toy with and the propagandist to exploit.

Undoubtedly Mr. Legge has done one wise and original thing. He has regarded the period from Alexander to Constantine as a whole. We have no space here in which to point out from how many points of view,

Some Recent Books

historically speaking, this was justifiable, and likely to lead to varied and valuable results. Much more labour will need to be expended, and is in fact being given, upon the tracts of history our near ancestors despised. Το Ἑλληνικόν won all homages: τὸ Ἑλληνιστικόν stood scorned. Another excellent feature of this long and learned book is the trouble taken over the "Gnostics." The extraordinary bye-products created by the combination of Judaism and of Christianity with surrounding paganisms and with one another are receiving, on their side too, the minute attention they deserve and failed for so long time to win. To Manicheism, again (a "heresy" which, with "Gnosticism," may claim, philosophically, to have been the parent of all the rest) the author gives unusual and well-deserved attention.

Mr. Legge is, as we said, fair, and elaborately learned. He is careful, too, not to be hypnotised by any name, however great. Thus he sits, on the whole, lightly to M. Cumont's authority even on Mithraism. (Thus, in the matter of the Leontocephalic statues.) Yet here, like men less wise than he, he falls victim to a phrase or a facile generalisation or a hasty reading. It is constantly forgotten how negative is our evidence as to Mithraism; how dependent on monuments; how hypothetical, too, is their interpretation. We find no positive evidence at all to satisfy us, for instance, that, "once introduced," Mithraic worship spread *like wildfire*. "Comme une trainée de poudre" was, we believe, the origin of this phrase, perhaps by now forgotten. Mithraic congregations were, it would seem, extremely small. Mithra had his separate shrines and worship, but Mithra-ism, in isolation, as a rival "religion," may perhaps have been quite negligible. Most of the Mithraic "analogies" dwindle singularly when examined with care. We suppose that some day it will cease to be the fashion to assert, without qualification, that Mithra's Church contained its "celibates and virgins." The phrase in Tertullian on which this statement rests all but certainly has for subject, as d'Alès very well has

Comparative Religion

shown, not *Mithras*, but *diabolus*; and the allusion is to paganism generally, not Mithraism in particular.

Mr. Legge does not, however, ignore Catholic scholarship; and it is pleasant to see the Bishop of Salford's name often mentioned in connection with Persian worship. Mr. Legge will not fail to find, with us, new cause to deplore the sack of the Louvain University, for the disaster that has thus overtaken the *Séminaire Ethnologique*, there initiated, is not easily alluded to in THE DUBLIN REVIEW.

Ω

DR. L. H. JORDAN'S *Comparative Religion, its Adjuncts and Allies* (Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1915. 12s. net) would appear to be a book upon Method. If we understand him aright, all investigation would proceed by a triple path of collection, co-ordination, and interpretation of facts. When the facts are "religious," he calls these three stages the History of Religions, Comparative Religion, and (perhaps) the Philosophy of Religions. For our part, we prefer to call the entire process, which we conceive as organic, the History of Religions: no mere collection of facts, not issuing into general conclusions and valuations, deserves the name of history in the full modern sense; certainly no scientific "grouping" is possible without directive principles which are themselves symptomatic of a philosophy already existing in the mind. Though Dr. Jordan sharply criticizes several of the authors, to whom he alludes, for their *predispositions* which cause them to group and judge their facts *in a particular way*, yet he has plenty of his own; on p. 519 all sorts of philosophical opinions are expressed which as strongly bias the "comparative religionist" who holds them as do those of anti-Christian scholars like M. Reinach or even Sir J. G. Frazer, or of Catholic students such as those he mentions. Many singular misconceptions of the Catholic position abound in this book, which is written with much courtesy and even a touch of fulsomeness in praising. Thus Catholic his-

Some Recent Books

torians of religions are considered to be overstepping their frontier when they indicate conclusions to be drawn from the evidence they adduce ; either, however, they have a wider concept of a historian's duty than has Dr. Jordan, or they are frankly speaking, at the moment, as philosophers, and musing on what they have collected and arranged. Again, he imagines Catholics are being illegitimately hampered by their creed if, in their study, they *refrain* from drawing certain conclusions. At worst, this is but a negative imposition : anyhow, it ensures for them, thus far, precisely that refusal to philosophize which Dr. Jordan mostly desiderates for the student of comparative religion as such. Clearly, the duty of a Catholic apologist, or general student, is to study *all* the evidence, with no pre-judgment whatever : if he considers that orthodox conclusions follow from it, surely he may say so ? If he does not, he may either hold his tongue and wait ; or, if he really thinks he must, apostatize. But no Catholic proclaims, because he is a Catholic, conclusions as being drawn from premisses he does not think contain them. If Dr. Jordan really thinks a believing Catholic cannot, in the study of evidence, face up to the evidence dispassionately, he had better follow a course of apologetics as taught by, say, M. Bricout, M. Bouvier, or any of the authors he decries for "parti pris." These reflections bear chiefly on the introduction and epilogue of his volume, and on the spirit in which criticism is bestowed on the immense quantity of books, his reviews of which, so to call them, occupy the bulk of his volume. They are books which, on the whole, he does not consider to deal with Comparative Religion in the strict sense. Ω

IT is hard to define the quality in Father Cuthbert's writing that charms us in all his books as it does in his latest, *The Romanticism of St. Francis* (Longmans, 6s. 6d. net.). It is not any particular distinction of his style ; which it is not exactly arresting or vivid, but even at times diffuse. He undoubtedly is at his best

Romanticism of St Francis

when he writes of Franciscan things. This, it seems to us, arises from his wonderful unity with his subject. When he writes of that intense spontaneous, intangible movement, whether in the days of its great originator or during the succeeding centuries that still hand down the intact tradition, there is a rare quality present, a luminousness we may say, caught from his inspiring theme and entirely in its spirit. He takes us, like a sure guide, into that rare atmosphere of St. Francis's pure and positive love for the good, untinged in him by that negative hatred of evil that so easily becomes (notably in Tolstoi who is so often compared to St. Francis) the ruling inspiration of the reformer's spirit.

St. Francis was a reformer in the full sense of the word, but his method was never the destructive one. The spirit that he originated was a pure, personally or individually experienced one, so uncompromising in all time with the spirit of the world that there was room for nothing negative in it. It was objective always; a going out to what it loves, not a turning away from what it hates. Father Cuthbert has put all this and much more in his first Essay. He speaks often of the intangible quality of the Franciscan Spirit.

It will be evident (he says) that to set down the Franciscan life in any merely external programme would be altogether misleading. Just because it was the spontaneous expression of elemental truths and ideals it escapes words, and can be adequately uttered only in a living tradition.

Thus he fixes the value of Holy Poverty well :

It must be remembered that Francis was not directly concerned with the spiritual problem of wealth, but with the spiritual problem of poverty as a condition for the realisation of the soul's freedom. Others before Francis had shown how wealth and property can be an instrument for the upbuilding of Christian character and Christian society. It was Francis who most clearly convinced men that poverty, too, may be a factor in moral and spiritual development. But just as wealth to effect its purpose

Some Recent Books

in the ideal of the Kingdom of Christ must be governed by Christian laws and motives, so, too, poverty attains to Christian freedom only when it is taken up by the Catholic Faith and the rights and responsibilities which flow from the Catholic conception of Society.

The Essay called "The Story of the Friars" is a valuable piece of historical analysis. One must be grateful, by the way, to Fr. Cuthbert for his careful and scholarly footnote references. Franciscan writers have not always excelled in this respect.

So much has been written about the infidelity of the Franciscan Order to its original purpose that few people who have not specially studied Franciscan history are aware of the continual effort made during the centuries which followed St. Francis's death to reproduce in the Order the original type as far as the changed conditions of time and place permitted.

He goes on to speak of the Friars' activities in the various spheres of social life, of intellect and art. He disposes of the reproach of "Holy Ignorance" that is sometimes thrown at the Franciscan attitude to scholastic theology.

Father Cuthbert might easily have made his book a tract for the times, so often as one reads does one see in the Franciscan spirit the antidote to the growing modern tendency in the world to combat confusion, sin and suffering with compulsion, in itself a far worse evil than any. But he refrains from this, contenting himself with an able exposition. May it inspire others to apply its principles. C. B.

IN a Foreword to his Gladstone Memorial Prize Essay for 1915, *The English Franciscans under Henry III.* (Oxford, B. H. Blackwell, 3s. 6d. net), Mr. John Sever apologises for the incompleteness of the work, and requests the reader to regard the essay as "an indication of lines upon which it is hoped to work in the future, rather than the result of completed work in

Mediæval Anthology

the past." Nevertheless he has written an excellent compendium of the history of the early English Franciscans so far as it is to be discovered in printed documents; and has, moreover, written with insight and judgment. Occasionally Mr. Sever is too confident in his assertions, as e.g., when he states that "the Friars were noted for their production of miracle plays, *the 'Ludus coventriæ' being entirely in their hands.*" Dugdale's authority for the attribution of this play to the Grey Friars is very doubtful. Probably due to an oversight is the statement (on p. 110) that "Adam Marsh sends back to Grosteste a present of money which the latter had sent him." The proffered gift was from Giles le Rous, Archdeacon of Northampton. (Cf. *Epistolæ Adæ de Marisco*, in *Mon. Franc. I.*, p. 195.) A closer acquaintance with Catholic liturgy would have prevented the author from describing the well-known *Salve Regina* as "the Bridal Song of the Virgin"! (p. 51). These, however, are but slight errors in a remarkably well written and accurate essay.

FR. C.

A CHARMING little *Mediæval Anthology* (Longmans. 2s. 6d. net) has been arranged by Miss Mary Segar, of Oxford. Frankly, the poems have been "modernized," "for the book has to be a first introduction to the riches of the twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, for readers who know no Old nor Middle English." Miss Segar has done this with the truest success. For the atmosphere is there. The English spirit has not evaporated—that inexplicably blithe yet tender, human yet most heavenly thing which is so incomparable—as we have tested, in trying to define it for a French and a Spanish reader, who "felt" and were delighted by it, and were struggling to find to what, in their own literatures, it was most akin. Just as the stories which reach us to-day from the different armies at the front are redolent each of a national humour and pathos, and courage itself is coloured by immemorial differences of culture and radical varieties

Some Recent Books

of temperament, so that none may boast and none should feel ashamed, so here, in these hymns and narratives and proverbs and secular lyrics, there is a special something which a reader seeks—*usque adeo quiddam proprium notumque requirit*—and has been, by Miss Segar's skill, allowed to find, and in it may rejoice. Her brief essay on the Early English Lyric is at once illuminating and stimulating. She lightly touches on the Christianizing of the old nature-worship, and indicates the like course in France, where, with troubadour and trouvère, summer-cult turned, however, more easily to love poems. Both countries created prayer-hymns; but "England's working and dancing songs" are her peculiar repayment for France's "chanson courtois," or love-song. Subtler art, perhaps, came with the Norman conquest to our shores, and a change in quality of passion; but the sturdiness of the English stock, its simplicity, and "healthy cheer" in piety (and even when we were impious, we were not decadent!) survived, sane till the Reformation.

C. C. M.

THE popular devout mind finds in S. Catharine of Siena a heroine to match its hero, S. Francis of Assisi. No other saints than these are held in such reverence by modern writers. Both have received the title of Seraphic, and it is no doubt the quality which this name implies that has caught the fancy of the world. It is their flaming love of God that makes their lives so understood of the people. Their religious worship was so divinely human that it could not but attract the children of men. Hence it is that C. M. Antony has made her *Saint Catharine of Siena, Her Life and Times* (Burns and Oates. 6s. net) an exceptionally interesting biography by giving as much as possible in the actual words of S. Catharine and her friends. The book is thus intensely alive with first-hand accounts of the incidents of the Saint's life. Almost it could be called an autobiography. Full of energy and sympathy and human trust, S. Catharine represents the soul at the topmost

Solitaires of the Sambuca

summit of Divine faith and love. For her the whole end of life is Peace. Her message was the Gospel of Peace, her Pope was the Father of Peace, her Church "the House of Holy Reconciliation." Aflame with love in an age of war and hate, she finally offered herself as a victim to God that in her might all suffering meet and all sin be quenched. "Be certain, dear children, that I have given my life for the Church" (p. 262). Her death was indeed a sacrifice; and in her last moments she, like all those who die for their fellows, became a priest, a "minister of the Blood." The illustrations are well chosen and carefully executed; and the quaint wood-cuts are perfectly delightful.

FR. B. J.

FOR lovers of *John William Walshe, F.S.A.*, the announcement of a new book by Mr Montgomery Carmichael comes as a notable event, and they will not be disappointed with *The Solitaires of the Sambuca* (Burns & Oates. pp. 252. 5s. net). There they will find the story of the foundation of a hermitage in the fastnesses of the Apennines by a Mr Casaubon, a wealthy English gentleman, and how his solitude was invaded by others like-minded with himself who desired to share in the life he had chosen. It is a book of great beauty, which few will read without keen interest and from which everyone will be able to gather something of spiritual profit for his soul on the virtues of silence and the joys of solitude.

WE should have thought ourselves happy when I was a lad studying Gaelic, more than half a century ago, had any Irish Texts been offered us so charmingly printed, and their implications so well brought out, as in the sixteen volumes of which the *Lives of SS. Declan and Mochuda*, by the Rev. P. Power of Cork University College, are the latest example. The Society has already issued, among other important works, Keating's *History of Ireland* in three parts, the Rev. P. S. Dineen's admirable *Irish-English Dictionaries*,

Some Recent Books

and such attractive ancient classics as the version of the *Æneid* contained in the *Book of Ballymote*, and the *Feast of Bricriu* from the *Leabhar Na b'Uidhre*. In the pages before us Father Power, who belongs to Waterford, takes his readers to the enchanted strand of Ardmore with St Declan, and to Lismore, the home of early mediæval monasticism, with St. Mochuda. His Irish text of the Ardmore Saint's legend was copied from a Brussels MS. of 1629, the fine characters of which are due to Brother Michael O'Clery. It is a wild romance, full of the marvels that we look for in Celtic tales, and it raises the curiously fascinating but perplexed question whether Christian communities were to be found in Erin previous to St. Patrick's Mission. "That in Declan we have to deal with an early Christian teacher of the Decies, there can be no doubt," says Father Power. The *Life of St. Mochuda* is at once more credible and a little less extravagant in detail. Lismore, to which scholars came not only from all parts of Ireland but from Northumbria, perhaps too from the Scots of the Clyde, kept Mochuda's memory green. There is much true history to be gleaned among the confused particulars here set down, especially as regards the working system of the old Irish Church with its great abbots exercising a sort of episcopal jurisdiction far and wide. Mochuda's career had its tragedy when he was driven out of Rahen "by the Kings of Tara," being a Southron man whose presence in Meath was not welcome to the monasteries around, as Durrow and Clonard, which latter is named in the text. This, says the Martyrology of Oenghus, was "one of the three worst counsels done in Ireland on the advice of Saints"—the other two were reckoned as "the exile of Columba and the cutting short of Ciaran's life." On all these points and the dates, places, buildings, relics, to which they refer, a series of excellent annotations throws light. The list of Mochuda's successors at Lismore, and of the old parishes in the Decies, will be highly valued by local historians. Father Power has broken fresh ground in the Lives of Irish Saints, which,

Story of the Catholic Church

whether Latin or Gaelic in language, have their stores of information not yet worked up into general literature. The English version might now and then be simplified. But a longer notice than I can give to this delightful piece of hagiography would have many pleasant things to add.

W. B.

EVEN were it not so well done as it is, *The Story of the Catholic Church*, by Father George Stebbing, C.S.S.R. (Sands & Co. Pp. xii, 704. 6s. net), would be very welcome. For a reference volume giving in compressed form the Annals of the Church from her foundation to the present day, with every important name, event and date duly recorded, and furnished with a good working set of indices, has long been a desideratum among both students and general readers of ecclesiastical history. We have tested Father Stebbing's book pretty severely from this point of view, and though, of course, in the first edition of such a work a few slips are inevitable, it has vindicated itself as a thoroughly reliable volume. It is well proportioned and well selected, and, while it is not, of course, the product of original research, it is based upon wide, accurate and laborious study of the best, sanest and most central secondary, and in many cases primary, authorities. Incidentally it shows how much can be accomplished in the scanty hours of leisure available amidst a busy life of missionary and administrative activity, and stands out in this respect as a notable encouragement and example.

We had at first approached Father Stebbing's book solely from the student's point of view, and were inclined to regret that he had not, by making it more exclusively a student's manual, found room, as he might have done, for a good deal more detail. But when we passed from the introductory chapter, which is not the best part of the book, and still more as we got well into the story, we found that the author had accomplished a far higher and more difficult task. For he has produced not only a good reference book, but a readable story, and, still

Some Recent Books

more, a real history—a work of art in the best sense, a canvas planned on a most difficult scale in which all the lights are clear, the shadows neither exaggerated nor attenuated, the conception unified and the atmosphere convincing. To compare a very good book with a thoroughly poisonous one, *The Story of the Catholic Church* should be to English-speaking Catholics in regard to their Church what Green's *Short History* is to English Protestants in regard to their country.

IN his book *The North-West Amazons* (Constable & Co. 12s. 6d.) Captain Whiffen gives a very full, a very interesting and a very valuable account of his wanderings in a district of enormous area, parts of which had been described by previous observers, such as Bates and Waterton, whose delightful "Wanderings" are, we hope, not being submerged by the flood of later-coming books. We must commence by congratulating the author on the high courage which carried him through his explorations, for anything more horrible than the task of ceaselessly walking, in pyjamas and carpet slippers, through seas of slush and amidst perpetual rain (for it seems to rain more in the district which he describes than it does even in this county of Cork, which is saying a good deal), one can hardly imagine. Add to the picture a constant condition of perspiration, for he tells us that it is a comfort to carry a towel round one's neck to wipe it off, and contests with every kind of noxious insect—not to speak of occasional snakes and vampires—and one gets some idea of what the explorer has to face. Captain Whiffen faced it, and has brought back for us a most valuable fund of information and a most interesting collection of photographs; and we may at once say that the anthropologist and ethnologist, as well as the student of languages and of folk-lore, will find much matter of interest in the pages of his book.

For us there is one point of great interest—there are many, but over only one can we delay. The tribes amongst whom Captain Whiffen spent his time seem

The North-West Amazons

to be carefully carrying out those experiments in practical Natural Selection which some scientific writers seem to think must become our rule if we are to raise the standard of the human race; which indeed have been recommended from high places within quite recent years, before, it is true, the war came as a corrective to some of these mischievous and, one may add, immoral ideas. Thus at the time of birth the child is examined, and if it is found to be defective in any way its mother quietly kills it and deposits its body in the forest. In any case immediately after birth it is dipped into cold water, a process which most certainly must weed out those babes which, though not defective in outward appearance, have any kind of weakness of constitution. When old age comes on, though the man or woman is not actually killed, he or she is not "officially" kept alive, but is left to die without food or help. Where infectious disease attacks a native he is left to his fate, even if he is not burnt with the house in which he lives. Cases of chronic illness meet with no sympathy, since a man who cannot hunt or fight is useless, and even a burden to the tribe. He is, therefore, either left to die or put out of the way by the medicine-man with a dose of one of the various poisons with which he is acquainted. If a mother dies leaving a young child, that young child, being a burden to its father, is killed, unless some one takes pity on it and adopts it. It is not a pretty picture, though Captain Whiffen seems to be rather captivated by it :

At every point it is clearly to be seen that the survival of the most fit is the very real and the very stern rule of life in the Amazonian forests. From birth to death it rules the Indians' life and philosophy. To help to preserve the unfit would often be to prejudice the chances of the fit. There are no armchair sentimentalists to oppose this very practical consideration. The Indian judges it by his standard of common sense : why live a life that has ceased to be worth living when there is no bugbear of a hell to make one cling to the most miserable of existences rather than risk greater misery ? (p. 170.)

Some Recent Books

Such appears to be the author's philosophy, and all we can say is that for those who like that sort of thing it is the kind of thing they will like. For our part we are glad to think that we live in a country where "arm-chair" sentimentalists, the writer's periphrasis for practical Christians, exert their influence, and where other considerations direct conduct than those non-moral ones which are drawn from a study of Nature alone.

B. C. A. W.

SIR BERTRAM WINDLE'S latest book, *A Century of Scientific Thought and Other Essays* (Burns and Oates, Ltd., pp. 288, 5s. net) is indeed a welcome gift. In these days of extreme specialisation the periodicals which set forth the result of original scientific work are necessarily highly technical, requiring much careful reading even by the trained scientist, while to the ordinary reader they are almost unintelligible and certainly unattractive. To render science accessible, to give accurate information to the busy Catholic—whether cleric or layman—of the trend of current scientific thought, and thus to arm him with a weapon of defence to meet any hostile attacks on his faith, is a task demanding qualities of a very varied character. Often the scientist is so much absorbed in the problems he has set himself to solve, that he has not leisure to interpret his results to the uninitiated. Yet great literary gifts without a scientific training are wholly inadequate to the task. The interpreter must himself have had some experience of the discipline of research in order that he may be in sympathetic touch with those whose work he would popularise. And other and not less urgent reasons for the necessity of such a training are, first, to insure that the journalist may not sacrifice scientific truth to the mere graces of literature, and secondly, that he may clearly appreciate the width of the gulf that yawns between hypothesis and fact. One has only to dip into this volume to be assured that the author has the power of interesting and instructing his reader in

Prehistoric Art

the latest results of scientific research. Had his reputation as a scientist not been firmly established long ago, and had the reader no knowledge of his scientific output, these essays alone, ranging over the fields of biology, geology, archæology, and anthropology would reveal not only erudition, but a broad-minded, sympathetic treatment, an honourable respect for the work of the expert, and a high appreciation of the value of hypothesis as a stimulus to discovery—qualities which proclaim at once the true man of science. Throughout the volume one feels that the Author is ever anxious to claim his Sonship to that Church which necessarily welcomes and protects any advance in Science, since every advance is but another revelation to His creatures of the Wisdom of the Creator. The busy priest in charge of Young Men's Sodalities, members of Natural History Societies, teachers of upper classes in secondary schools, as well as the more leisured reader will thus find the work most useful. At the same time it should certainly find a place in every secondary school and college library.

M. T.

WHEN one considers the extent and interest of the discoveries which recent years have seen of art galleries in caves of the far-off Palæolithic period and of the other manifestations of an aesthetic sense in the dwellers in those gloomy retreats, it is not wonderful that attempts should be made to bring together what is known on the subject by experts, for the information of the public which is not in the habit of studying those learned journals in which discoveries of the kind alluded to are first made known to the world. It is not long since we had the opportunity of expressing an opinion concerning a work on the subject, named *The Childhood of Art*, and now Mr. Parkyn's very complete and very scholarly book *Prehistoric Art* (London. Longmans, Green & Co. 1915. Price 10s. 6d.) comes under our notice. We may at once say that it is deserving of every commendation. It is very complete and even covers

Some Recent Books

points such as the ornamentation of early pottery, gold, amber and jet ornaments, not always dealt with in books of this kind. It is admirably illustrated and, in a book on this subject, that is a first consideration.

It is based on a very complete study of the literature of the subject and it is admirably documented. We can very thoroughly commend it as an excellent account of the subject as known to-day.

B. C. A. W.

IT is impossible for a Catholic reviewer, in the limits of a short notice, to appraise such a book as Mr. J. R. Moreton Macdonald's *History of France* (Methuen & Co. Three vols. Pp. xvi, 366, 400, 552. 22s. 6d. net). It is not so much that he is moved to protest in detail, as that his whole conception of History is one and Mr. Macdonald's another. There is no such thing as "objective" History. The writing of History is an Art, as distinguished from its subsidiary sciences—the critical appraisement of sources and the like—and as such it is a matter of personality, standpoint, philosophy, in Newman's use of the word. Mr. Macdonald's standpoint is simply the well-known one of the English Protestant tradition and is indicated in one simply amazing sentence in his Introduction. Not all his moderation of language and evident intention of impartiality and "objectiveness" can avail to make it other. All one can say to him is: "You are quite entitled to your view of history, but ours is different." And if our view be not the right one, that of a Christendom grown from a centre outwards—Rome, as the mother first of its civilization, then of its religion, with the nations as her daughters and France the eldest—then all the history of Europe is a chaos, and the cause for which we are fighting to-day an illusion. The Protestant tradition of History makes nonsense of it all. This is not to say that Mr. Macdonald's book is not of considerable value. Any book must be, that gives us in compendious form the names, facts and dates of two thousand years of France, with an admirable index, substantial bibliographies, and constant

My Slav Friends

reference to sources and authorities, the whole based on a thorough familiarity with the most modern French research. If only for this reason, Mr. Macdonald's volumes replace once and for all those of Dean Kitchin on our reference shelves.

H. S. D.

IT is interesting to compare the tone of the books on Russia which have appeared since the war began with those we were given before that period. Mr. Rothay Reynolds has one good remark on this subject in his new book, *My Slav Friends* (Mills and Boon, Ltd. pp. 307, 10s. 6d. net). The old style demanded thrills and horrors whenever Russia was mentioned.

An American journalist once showed me a telegram he was about to send to New York. It was an account of the trial of a prominent revolutionary, and ended with the words "he was condemned to the mines of Siberia for life." The fellow might have said with equal accuracy that Mrs. Pankhurst had been condemned to the galleys.

"But," I said, "people aren't condemned to the mines. They haven't been condemned to the mines for years and years."

"I know," he said coolly, "it's the technical phrase we always use. It gives a thrill."

In sudden contrast to this kind of thing we have now one book after another representing Russia as inhabited by docile Early Christians in the last stage of other-worldliness. Mr. Reynolds pictures for us a lecturer on similar lines telling Russians about England :

In England the shops are closed on Sundays. The English do not wish to buy and sell on Sundays, they wish to pray. On the windows of their churches are painted figures of the saints. The English like to feel that they are surrounded by the saints when they are in church. And I cannot help feeling that it is the saints that glow in the windows of English churches that have made England the land of self-sacrifice.

I remember once being in London and crossing the Waterloo Bridge. A young soldier, one of the heroic British soldiers, passed in front of me, and I saw a woman-of-the-people touch his arm and stop him; a motherly soul, wearing the national

Some Recent Books

head-dress adorned with ostrich feathers, splashes of ruby and emerald against the murk of a London sky. And as I passed the two I saw her slip something into the boy's hand, and heard her say: "Here, my lad, go and get yourself two pennor'th of gin."

Twopence! eight kopecks! a great sum for a poor woman to give to a stranger, money she could ill afford. And I said to myself, Yes, it is true, England is the home of self-sacrifice.

Mr. Reynolds' own book is full of humour, and tries to give a true picture of a land and people he knows well. It is well worth reading. He has a slight tendency to repeat himself, a fault which he will do well to correct when the book reaches its second edition. A. B.

FR. THURSTON'S volume of collected Essays entitled *The Memory of Our Dead* (Burns & Oates. Pp. x, 246. 2s. 6d. net) is in his very best manner, in more than one of its chapters as important for scholarship as it is throughout fascinating in the reading. Chapters on the practice of the early centuries, and on the Diptychs and their developments, lead us up to a delightful little piece of original research into mediæval custom—an account of the Mortuary Rolls, those still more elaborate prototypes of the elaborate *billets de faire part* to which we are accustomed in modern France. A chapter of real importance for modern controversy follows, in which Sir J. G. Frazer's theorizings about the "Feast of the Dead" are subjected to a penetrating and original criticism. A chapter on "Observances, Abuses and Survivals" gives further scope for destructive criticism of the same theorist's aberrations, as well as for Fr. Thurston's own special gift of presenting the work of the antiquary in always interesting and often diverting guise.

IN *The War and the Prophets* (Burns & Oates. pp. 190. 2s. 6d. net) the same writer returns once more to the favourite occupation of saving us from believing too much. He goes through the various prophecies of

The Wayside

the war which have been current since the outbreak of hostilities and, admirable as ever in destructive criticism, shows them up mercilessly as mere repetitions of older prophecies which were current in previous wars, or else as actual fabrications put forth with a purpose which is obvious enough. Our only criticism is that he does the work even too thoroughly and does not allow to some prophecies the credit which is fairly due to them. Indeed, so thorough is his scepticism that it comes almost as a surprise to find that there is one prediction in which he is almost inclined to believe. To discover which it is we must refer our readers to the book itself. Though we say it with some regret, we feel bound to acknowledge that in this matter of the prophecies our judgement in the main coincides with that of Father Thurston.

IN *The Wayside, A Priest's Gleanings* (Burns and Oates. 3s. 6d. net), Fr. Vincent McNabb, O.P., has gathered together a number of essays and reviews. Such an assembly of articles, written for different periodicals with different audiences, must necessarily be intensely diverse in scope as in composition. But this has its charm; indeed, in these days of abbreviations, its value; for it is just an idea, suggested and partly elaborated, that most stimulates us; and in this volume the freshness necessary for this is the chief note. At times a point may be laboured to extravagance, yet even then there are sentences of perfect cadence to arrest the mind and start it thinking. Take the article on Post-Impressionism. It will be for many the most helpful of all, for here an attempt is made to justify by common sense what common sense most revolts against. Yet the attempt is successful, and the intense spirit of sympathy which dominates all Fr. McNabb's writings interprets the modern mind to itself. Such sympathy may only too easily, in writing on such a subject as the horrors of Belgium's tragedy, become hysterical. *Europe's Ewe Lamb* (Washbournes, Ltd., 3s. 6d. net) is just saved from that fate by its vein of thorough and well-digested

Some Recent Books

Thomistic learning. The title, indeed, shows how nearly the book approaches the ridiculous; but fortunately it recovers itself and gathers strength as it grows. There are some happy expressions in its pages, such as "Germany's splendid treachery of preparedness." The book is valuable especially as recording the contemporary impressions of a soul sensitive to suffering and tears.

OF special interest to our readers will be the volume, *Pages Religieuses* (Tours, Mame & Cie. Pp. 340. 3.50 francs), in which M. René Bazin has gathered together some of his contributions of the past fifteen years to the religious thought of France. Addresses, newspaper articles, short memoirs, extracts from some of the more general passages in the novels—they form a picture, as varied and fascinating as it is instructive, of a period full of great issues. The volume is divided into two parts—"Temps de Paix" and "Temps de Guerre," and it is no disparagement to M. Bazin's best-known work to say that the crisis of his country and of Christian civilisation has evoked in his writing a strength and depth beyond even those of "Le Blé qui lève." The chapters on "La France qui prie," "La pitié," and "Les parents à la guerre" are among the most touchingly beautiful things we have read since the war began, and the twin essays, "L'amitié anglaise" and "Chez nous aussi," with their heartfelt appreciation of the English soldier-guests of France, are gifts of friendship for which we thank M. Bazin with full hearts.

THE COMTE DE CHABROL is a veteran statesman of 1870 and of the wonderful resurrection of France in the following years. From the retirement of his old age in the heart of Auvergne he has given us, in the beautiful pages of his little book, *Notre Patriotisme, ce qu'il doit être* (Paris: Lethielleux. Pp. 114. 75 centimes), a thrilling and heartening message from the soul of the true France, oldest daughter of the Church. The contrast of then and now, as the Count develops it and

Every Irishman's Library

illustrates it from his own experience, is indeed significant of good for France and for Christendom alike, though at the same time certain elements of difficulty are judiciously estimated. We wish we could quote many a passage, but we must leave our readers to get the little book for themselves, assuring them that the trouble of sending to France for it will be well repaid. There is something pathetic in the sub-title, *Loin du Front*, 1914-1915; but the Count may rest assured that his pen serves God as well to-day as did his sword forty-five years ago.

EVERY IRISHMAN'S LIBRARY (Fisher Unwin, 2s. 6d. each) is a new series of books relating to Ireland, similar in design (though differing in format) to "The New Irish Library" of some twenty or more years ago. Some of these volumes, such as *Irish Oratory* (Introduction by T. M. Kettle) and *Humours of Irish Life* (Introduction by C. L. Graves) are in the nature of Elegant Extracts, a kind of work which personally repels us, though it must be admitted that it has its admirers and thus its *raison d'être*. But this may be said about both of these volumes, that the Introductions alone are worth a large share of the price demanded, especially that by Mr Graves on Irish Novelists, which is the best essay of the kind that has come under our notice. *Irish Poetry* (Introduction by A. P. Graves) is, as indeed we should expect from its compiler, a very good anthology of Irish verse even in competition with the other excellent collections which have appeared during the past ten or twenty years. *Wild Sports of the West* (Introduction by the Earl of Dunraven) brings back the days of his youth to the present reviewer, since, though now almost forgotten, it was then a well-known book. It has a distinct interest from several points of view and was well worth reprinting in this series. *Essays and Poems by Thomas Davis* (Introduction by T. W. Rolleston) is a handy collection of writings by one whose name will not soon be forgotten in Ireland. We have reserved to the last what we think to be the best of the six, namely,

Some Recent Books

Professor Douglas Hyde's *Legends of Saints and Sinners*. These always interesting and remarkable, and sometimes very beautiful, tales have been collected, mostly by the author of the book, from Irish-speaking peasants and translated into English. Some at least of them have appeared in *The Religious Poetry of Connacht*, but there will be many people who will be glad to possess this volume, with its excellent notes, and we anticipate for it a very large sale. We hope that this series, a number of further volumes in which are promised, will have a great success.

B. C. A. W.

IT is perhaps unfortunate that the volume of Messrs. Burns & Oates' recent devotional and liturgical publications which is undoubtedly the most beautiful as a piece of book-making, should be one that appeals to a limited clientèle. *Epistles and Gospels for Sundays and Festivals* is in fact described as "the Pulpit edition," and its size of page and general typographical planning accord with its aim. The careful editing of Fr. Lattey, S.J., the perfect printing by the Oxford Press from the fine, rugged old *Fell* type, and the ample arrangement of the text, so disposed as to avoid as far as possible any turning of the page, combine to fit means to end. Not the least remarkable feature of the work is its production for such a price as 3s. 6d. But even if the general book-buyer feels the volume to be outside his scope, he has in it ready to hand a gift for a priest-friend fully worthy of the latter's high office.

The general reader, however, is provided with a book only less beautiful because its page is necessarily less ample and its type less imposing, in the same firm's complete edition of Bishop Challoner's *Meditations for Every Day in the Year*. Of the worth of this most solid and best tested of books of Spiritual reading it is needless to speak; it is the crowning achievement of a literary career which is among the most amazing examples of strenuousness, versatility and thoroughness under almost impossible conditions. The setting is worthy of the

Athenæum Index

book; we have again the *Fell* type, with ornaments of the same period, to which even those who do not care for the period will allow the merit of distinction, and in addition some fine Dürer reproductions by way of artistic interest, and India paper by way of modern and luxurious convenience—and again the very low price of 3s. 6d. We cannot, however, feel that the end-pages of the two books are without a tinge of affectation. We have space only for bare mention of two other and similar books, as notable typographically and as cheap—the shilling pocket edition, in leather, of the Revised Latin Text of *The Little Office of Our Lady*, and the pocket edition, costing eighteen pence, of the *Excerpta ex Libro cui Titulus Ordo Administrandi Sacramenta*, giving the various offices and rites which are from time to time required away from church.

THE proprietors of the *Athenæum* (Bream's Buildings, Chancery Lane) are to be congratulated on their public spirit in undertaking the production of a *Subject Index to Periodicals* which does more than take the place of that of the *Review of Reviews* broken off some years ago. Such a work is one of those invaluable pieces of literary spade-work which, however, present difficulties on the financial side almost insuperable. The subscription of £2 10s. is quite low, and individual students have the great advantage of being able to purchase separate class-sections at the very low price of a shilling. Those covering Theology and Philosophy, Education, The War, and Fine Arts and Archæology lie before us, and have already proved their solid usefulness. The matter touching Catholic interests is admirably full and well classified. Unlike Poole's, the *Athenæum* Index covers periodicals other than Reviews and Magazines—a fact which enhances its value enormously. Over 350 periodicals are indexed and the entries for 1915 amount to 10,000.

CHRONICLE OF SOME RECENT PHILOSOPHICAL WORKS

DURING the last fifteen months the usual output of philosophic works has been in large measure suspended. Speculative philosophy at least, while being a great and lasting necessity, does not press so insistent a claim upon our attention when the life and destinies of nations hang in the balance. The output, however, while being small is by no means negligible; though there is comparatively little of outstanding importance. Mr. Balfour's *Gifford Lectures* form perhaps the most striking and suggestive contribution. As, however, they have already been considered in this REVIEW we can only record our passing impression that they are both valuable and inconclusive—valuable as an introduction to the older classical proofs of God's existence, and inconclusive because of a certain hesitancy and indecision that lurks in the learned author's theory of knowledge.

From the *Gifford Lectures* we may, however, pass immediately to Mr. Clement Webb's *Studies in the History of Natural Theology* (Clarendon Press. Pp. 363. 10s. 6d.). After reading a mass of volumes on the "philosophy of religion," which on account of its unbounded range, and unsureness of purpose, is so strangely unconvincing, we turn willingly to consider the older discipline of Natural Theology, which at least had a scientific oneness of aim. Mr. Webb opens his volume with an introduction to the history of natural theology, which failed completely to arrest our attention. We seem to be wandering through the fields of history, bent on the most casual examination of the opinion of various philosophers, struggling against the author's confusion of the widely different studies of religion and theology, and struggling, too, to rivet our attention in spite of the enervating, ungainly sentences. With the close of the introduction, however, we open more interesting chapters on the theological speculations of individual philosophers, Plato, Anselm, Abélard, Thomas Aquinas, Raymond of Sebonde, Pietro Pompanazzi, and Lord Herbert of Cherburg. In these studies there is a vast amount of useful and important matter; particularly, we would suggest, in the treatment of the mediæval authors who, elsewhere, are too frequently dismissed in a few hesitating judgments. Mr. Webb has clearly specialized on St. Anselm's work, and apparently believes that the famous *id quo majus cogitari nequit* proof leads to some valid conclusion. On p. 190 we read "we have already seen that what is proved by it is an absolute reality." The "proof" is elusive, stimulating, challenging, seductive—are not Bossuet, Descartes and Leibniz to be ranked among Anselm's disciples?—but, we would submit, wholly lacking in foundation or conclusion. As Anselm quite well saw, it is one thing to have a concept of the greatest reality, and quite another to show that it exists. But he does not seem to have observed that when one proves that the greatest reality cannot be divorced from the concept of existence, that it

Philosophical Works

cannot lack the "ultimate perfection of being," one has still to show that such a being exists in the world of extra-mental realities. By way of a counter-attack, we may add that it requires no philosophic *aqua regia* to dissolve Anselm's mighty concept into its constituent factors. In so doing we observe that the only positive nucleus is drawn from the perfections that we witness in the real world, which have here been isolated, purified and raised to a higher power. The concept on closer inspection takes us back, not to God, but to the minds of men that stand facing the world of real things. Among the many other passages which drew us up somewhat abruptly we may mention that Mr. Webb observes with an approval, which almost touches enthusiasm, "that Anselm is not trammelled . . . by any hard-and-fast distinction between the spheres of revealed and natural theology." Strangely enough, many of the most careful students of things mediæval have been led by the same observation to conclude that philosophic thought with Anselm was only in its infancy. We might even add that the neglect of a hard-and-fast distinction between spheres of knowledge that differ in matter, method and angle of vision, may lead to dogmatic philosophies and rational theologies, and other similar confusions.

We cannot delay, unfortunately, to consider the author's sympathetic treatment of Abélard, whose genius deserves the warmest recognition. To suggest, however, "that the very method of scholasticism (*sic et non*) may without exaggeration be called his creation" is wide of the mark. It was, as is now well known, not a creation but an adaptation of a system in vogue among the canonists.

Mr. Webb's study of St. Thomas left us with the curious impression that the philosopher's thought, detached from life and experience, dangled helplessly between Heaven and earth. Some of the judgments, too, astonished us not a little. "Certainly inferior in metaphysical genius to Anselm," we read, "and probably to Abélard in genuine originality of mind, the task laid upon Thomas by the spirit of his age was that of establishing a synthesis between the dogma of the Church, and as much of the teaching of Aristotle . . . as could be harmonised therewith." The comparison with Anselm and Abélard is indeed unusual, while in the explanation of St. Thomas's task, we find a complete misunderstanding of the aims of a pioneer who loved philosophy for its own sake. When further we read that Deism sprang from "the delimitation (of revealed and natural theology) which we specially associate with St. Thomas" we can only turn the pages and hope that other philosophers will be handled with more insight and ability. Probably the hope is justified, but as one scans the paragraphs on the mediæval men, one can only muse:

"A little more and how much it is,
A little less and what worlds away."

From Mr. Webb's studies, we turn naturally to *God and Freedom in Human Experience* (Arnold. Pp. 312. 10s. 6d.) in which Dr. D'Arcy, Bishop of Down, presents us with his Donnellan lectures for the years

Philosophical Works

1913-1914. "The aim of these lectures," we are told, "is to show that the new investigations which the world owes in the main to M. Bergson supply the means of a further advance along the path which had been marked out by the great succession of the immortals." In fact, the author is convinced that "we are on the eve of a new statement in theology" which is to be guided by Bergson's principles. We can only wonder how those principles could possibly be applied to the facts of religion without wrecking all the old basic conceptions of an immutable God, of freedom, and personal immortality. If change be the beginning and end, not to say the sum total, of all reality we are left groping in the dark for those stable elements without which neither philosopher nor theologian can build a coherent system of experience or Revelation. Dr. D'Arcy has drunk deep draughts of the curiously imaginative, and unproven metaphysic of the French philosopher, and, as a direct result, many of his restatements of old problems are insecure and untenable. Some of them, indeed, seem to undermine the very foundations of Christianity. Within the limits of a brief review, we can only select a statement here and there for comment. On p. 136, we read, for instance, "A man is free then, in the exercise of his will, when he truly wills because he is developing the life that is in him, expressing his character, putting forth himself in the way which corresponds to his real being." In these few words the whole doctrine of freedom is explained away to the vanishing point, and we are left with the old theory of psychological determinism. If our actions at their best are the natural outcome of temperament, character or nature, it is quite clear that, while being free from without, we are determined from within. Freedom, in any real sense, involves deliberation and choice—the power to resist even attractive desires, which really expresses the bent of our nature, and to choose courses which, for reasons of principle or honour, seem preferable. If there be no choice, freedom is robbed of all proper significance, and made to play the part of a synonym for self-impulsion.

Later in the volume, Dr. D'Arcy gives an interesting and powerful treatment of the problem of pain. At the close he asks the old question as to how the sufferings of the good may be "reconciled with the wisdom, power and goodness of God," and in point of fact gives the old answer. How shall the finite measure or comprehend the Infinite mind? Bishop Butler's answer, that certain problems are beyond our comprehension, is dismissed as unsatisfactory. We want a principle to show why the problem is "insoluble," and Dr. D'Arcy finds that principle in Bergson's philosophy. Our expectation is aroused. "If," he asks, "intellect fails to apprehend the fullness of each man's consciousness, how can it grasp the relation of that experience to a degree of reality (the Divine experience) higher than itself?" Apart from the confusion of language and metaphysic, the answer is that which has been given for centuries by the Christian apologists.

In his chapter on the future life, we read . . . "the soul, in the only sense in which the word can be properly used, is the living experience in

Philosophical Works

its fullness. . . . This experience possesses unity, continuity, individuality. It is self-conscious and self-directing. It is the soul or self of man. It is the Personality." And the future life means that the fullness of experience, which *is* the soul, shall be widened and deepened. The soul is the fullness of living experience? we query. But living experience is made up of groups of transitory phenomena, of emotions and feelings, of sensations and thoughts that last for a while and then pass beyond the margin of consciousness. Where is the unity, for instance, in this desperate, fleeting mass of conscious events? Continuity it may have, and something of a distinctive character, which we suspect is what Dr. D'Arcy means by individuality, but unity it certainly lacks. If the whole statement were meant to be an interpretation of the Buddhist or theosophical doctrine of transmigration of Karma, we would have read it with pleasure. As it purports to reinterpret the Christian or philosophic doctrine of immortality, we cannot congratulate the author on this extraordinary confusion. But it is ever the same with those who follow the thought of Bergson. Souls, persons, things, and God Himself become dissolved into a group of changing phenomena, which receive fitting titles in terms of the fullness or totality of experience. How could it be otherwise with a system that finds nought but change—without any subject of inherence—within the length and breadth of the universe? We are obviously in need of a little Aristotelean metaphysic or—let us not seem intransigent—some metaphysic which bears the hall-mark of coherence.

It has become usual now to translate Benedetto Croce's works into English, and Mr. Douglas Ainslie, has recently given us *What is Living and What is Dead in the Philosophy of Hegel* (Macmillan. Pp. 217. 7s. 6d.). Signor Croce is, as is well known, a fervent admirer of Hegel; though he shows in this volume that he can temper discipleship with criticism. The study is by far the most interesting metaphysical work of the Italian philosopher; though, to be blunt, we have, as a rule, found little inspiration or penetration in his thought. The volume opens with a chapter on "The Dialectic," which is not uninteresting. But in order to show the necessity and "glory" of Hegel's triple treatment of the one concept—for this is the real essence of the Dialectic—we begin apparently at any distance from our earth and life, and never regain contact with either. Philosophy seems to be a game of reconciling and fusing concepts that gyrate in a vacuum. As, however, we have given many laborious hours to the study of Hegel and his followers, we readily grant that the impression is false. The fact remains that whenever a philosopher begins by throwing down and manipulating a number of contradictory conceptions, we begin to long for some treatment of philosophy that shall do less violence to human experience. In the course of this chapter Signor Croce answers many trivial objections against the dialectical method with success and ease, though he never once vindicates the starting point. He "glories" in the wonderful Hegelian vision of the "concrete universal"—a violent phrase involving nearly all of Hegel's presuppositions!

Philosophical Works

—and proceeds to inform us that by this means “philosophy thus set in friendly relation with poetry, enters that state which in these days of Nietzschean phraseology is called ‘dionysiac.’” In consequence, the Italian philosopher in no way objects to Rosmini’s contention that “the system of Hegel does nothing less than make being go mad, and introduce madness into all things.” Did not the German master himself say: “The true is the Bacchic delirium in which not one of the components is not drunk,” and add, by way of rendering his thought utterly intangible, that the delirium is also “simple and transparent repose”? Delirium we understand, and also repose, but how “the true” can be either a Bacchic frenzy or a “transparent” rest, or above all both at one and the same time, passes our comprehension.

In a later chapter Signor Croce shows with considerable lucidity that the dualism of “nature as it is” and “nature as it is thought” was never finally overcome by the philosopher of Jena. Indeed, he remarks very forcibly that the triadic expedient—the old dialectical game—to which Hegel had recourse in resolving the antithesis of nature and spirit, shows that he was always entangled in dualism. But has Signor Croce ever observed the reason? It is quite impossible to convey any doctrine of spiritualistic monism—and therefore, we infer, to think about it coherently—in any of the European languages. They all bear stamped across them in a hundred grammatical and syntactical forms the natural thoughts and prejudices of men in favour of some form of dualism.

The author’s summary of his own findings may terminate this brief reference. “It is necessary,” he says, “to preserve the vital part of Hegel’s philosophy, i.e., the new concept of the concept, the concrete universal, together with the dialectic of opposites and the doctrine of the degrees of reality; to refute with the help of that new concept, and by developing it, all panlogism, and every speculative construction . . . of history and nature : . . . and finally to resolve the whole into a pure philosophy of spirit.” As regards the programme for the future, we can only say that we await its accomplishment not without misgiving. For the rest, it seems to us a pity, while so much of Hegel’s thought is being “scrapped,” that we should maintain the “new concept of the concept,” the “concrete universal”—which is nothing short of a contradiction in terms—or for that matter, that strange doctrine of degrees of reality, which drives so many excellent philosophers to give “dionysiac” or at least incoherent answers to so many urgent problems. The book is emphatically interesting, in spite of the occasional exotic flavour of the translators’ English.

We pass to consider a work which falls into the typically American group of compilations, *Pragmatism and the Problem of the Idea*, by Rev. John T. Driscoll (Longmans. pp. 276. 6s.). The work of analysis is often very well done, and we are presented with a good statement of American, English and French pragmatism, with many quotations from the works of James, Dewey, Royce, Bergson, and the rest. By way of critique, the propositions are made to collide—indeed, there is little

Philosophical Works

difficulty in engineering the feat—with the philosophy of the schools. To take a simple instance, we are told that many eminent pragmatists hold the doctrine of "mediate perception": that we perceive not *things*, but our *ideas* and *sense-impressions* about things, and that from our psychic processes we are led, if indeed we are led at all, to infer the existence of an object-world. Now scholasticism, the author continues, holds the theory of "immediate perception"; that the psychic event is the *id quo* and not the *id quod percipitur*. We are told that this statement is a "primitive fact," "confirmed by common teaching," "embodying the experience of the whole human race." The whole vast problem is solved in the following words: "Scholastic-philosophy holds that for the perception of external objects three conditions are necessary"—a subject perceiving, an object perceived, and some contact or union between subject and object. Frankly, we find here nothing but assertions, which are equally impossible in philosophy, whether they be presented in the name of scholasticism, idealism, or pragmatism. Moreover, references to St. Thomas or other leaders do not in the least tend to put us in a better humour; for he is a poor disciple of St. Thomas who quotes the authority of any name, or indeed anything but the authority of a sound, convincing argument. We know, and have been told not infrequently, that scholastic philosophy holds these theses, although we ourselves have looked in vain for adequate proofs in support. The theory of knowledge did not present itself as a group of urgent problems to the men of the 13th century. In this respect times have changed, and yet many of us continue to quote the words of the 13th century masters with no little complacency. We are convinced after a long inquiry that their outlook may be defended in a series of adequate proofs, which involve no assumption and no form of dogmatism. But Dr. Driscoll will surely observe that it is somewhat gratuitous and not a little dogmatic to appeal to some "primitive fact" or "universal conviction" in order to solve the one group of problems that present great and lasting difficulty in philosophy. In fact, is it not an evasion of the real difficulty which the pragmatists attempt, however unsuccessfully, to meet? In spite of these criticisms, we are sure that Dr. Driscoll's book will prove acceptable and useful to those who need a concise and unadorned statement of pragmatist theory, while it will, we fear, fail to convert any pragmatist. We are tempted to ask why it is that neo-scholasticism does not resound through Europe. Its propositions are crystal-clear: its terms are well defined: it is a carefully articulated system. The difficulty must somehow lie in the exponents, who, perhaps, presuppose too much in their proofs, which tend, sometimes, to be statements rather than conclusions.

Dr. H. O. Taylor did well to give us his "night-thoughts" and other fruitful meditations on "Deliverance" (Macmillan. Pp. 294. 5s. 6d.). As the result of many "watches of the night," and of thoughts that have been criticised in the more searching light of day, he has become convinced that "the needs of men are not the same universally, and the human adjustment may relate to conduct, or to speculation, to distress

Philosophical Works

at life's chain of torment, or to fear of extinction : it may relate to the impulse to speculate and know, or to the need to be saved." Every religion is a typical means of adjustment or deliverance, but there are many other systems which have no connection in any true sense with religion. Here, then, in successive chapters we are given a view of those means of deliverance which appealed most forcibly to the leaders of mankind in the East and West—in Chaldea, Egypt, China, Japan, India, Persia, Greece, and Palestine. The chapters on Buddhism and the Greek philosophers appealed to us keenly, but we wonder whether it is desirable or indeed fair to close the story of the Greek adjustment with the Stoic and Epicurean schools. Would it not be better to show the last development and fusion of many thoughts in the wonderful system of Plotinus ? Moreover, we felt that Dr. Taylor had wandered from his purpose in introducing his interesting chapter on "the heroic adjustment." It becomes all the more strange when we turn to the closing chapters on "Jesus," "Paul," and "Augustine." However, let us not seem ungrateful for a thoughtful volume. Naturally we differ from Dr. Taylor on a hundred points, and prescinding from theological differences, more especially in his suspense of judgment or hesitancy concerning personal immortality, the fact remains that we were always refreshed by his quiet wisdom.

We terminated our last Chronicle, some 15 months ago, by promising a more ample reference to Professor Burnet's *Greek Philosophy*, Part I. (Macmillan. pp. 360. 10s. 6d.) and to Mr. Shand's *Foundations of Character* (Macmillan. pp. 532. 12s.). In the interim, however, doubtless all students of the history of philosophy and of Greek thought have purchased Professor Burnet's study, and now await the second part with no little impatience. It is thus wholly unnecessary to suggest that it is a vivid and even enthralling presentation of a group of systems, some of which have too often been synoptized in a number of almost unintelligible propositions. With regard to Mr. Shand's volume we shall only say, at this distance of time, that we have read and re-read his profound and interesting study of human character, with its searching analysis of temperament, passion, motive, mood and desire. It is an admirable and in some ways a pioneer study.

For the rest we promise, all being well, to return in our next survey to Mr. Thomas Whitaker's *Theory of Abstract Ethics*, which discloses neither its meaning nor its implications too readily. Much is obscure, and some of it resembles the "breathless" report of a debate or conversation. The philosopher who "outweighs them all" is found in Kant. Also we hope to say something about M. Clodius Piat's excellent work on *Leibniz* (Félix-Alcan. pp. 368. 7 frs. 50), which, meanwhile, will prove a stimulating study to all who have felt the attractiveness of the character and thought of the great mathematician and philosopher.

JOHN G. VANCE.

THE INDEX TO VOL. 158

The Titles to Articles are printed in Italics.

- A**IRCRAFT in the Present War, by Eric Stuart Bruce, 84.
 Allemagne, Le Danger pour l'Eglise, by Canon Gaudeau, *reviewed*, 13.
 Allies, T. W., Journal in France and Letters from Italy, *reviewed*, 188
 Amazons, The North-West, by T. Whiffen, *reviewed*, 398.
 Anthologia Laureata, by Rev. C. C. Martindale, S.J., 259.
 Antony, C. M., Saint Catharine of Siena, *reviewed*, 394.
 Apotheosis and After-Life, by Mrs. Arthur Strong, *reviewed*, 193.
 Aristocracy, by Bernard Holland, 67.
 Aristocracy, A Defence of, by A. M. Ludovici, *reviewed*, 67.
 Art After the War, by Rev. T. Gerrard, 51.
 Ashby, Hugh T., Infant Mortality, *reviewed*, 324.
 Athenæum Subject Index to Periodicals, *reviewed*, 409.
 Attila and the Huns, by Edward Hutton, *reviewed*, 202.

BAKER, Judge Sir Geo. Sherston, *Catholicism and International Law*, 103.
 Balfour, The Gifford Lectures of Mr., by the Rev. John Rickaby, S.J., 119.
 Balkans, Italy and the Adriatic, The, by R. D. Seton Watson, *reviewed*, 201.
 Barnes, Mgr., *Islam: A Christian Heresy*, 288.
 Barry, Canon, *Before the Hierarchy*, 136.
 Baudrillart's War Publications, Mgr., *reviewed*, 200.
 Bazin, René, Pages Religieuses, *reviewed*, 406.
 Bédier, Joseph, German Atrocities from German Evidence, *reviewed*, 200.
 Before the Hierarchy, by Canon Barry, 136.
 Belgium, A Journal of Impressions in, by May Sinclair, *reviewed*, 203.
 Belief and Practice, by Will Spens, *reviewed*, 191.
 Belloc, Hilaire, and John Lingard, The History of England, *reviewed*, 183.
 Between St. Dennis and St. George, by F. M. Hueffer, *reviewed*, 203.
 Birth Time of the World, The, by Dr. Joly, *reviewed*, 198.
 Black, Clementina, Married Women's Work, *reviewed*, 324.
 Bland, J. O. P., Germany's Violations of the Laws of War, Ed. by, *reviewed*, 200.
 Bridges, Robert, The Spirit of Man, *reviewed*, 259.
 Bruce, Eric Stuart, *Aircraft in the Present War*, 84.
 Burnet, Professor, Greek Philosophy, *reviewed*, 416.
 Burns and Oates, Liturgical Publications of Messrs., *reviewed*, 408.

- C**ARMICHAEL, Montgomery, The Solitaries of the Sambuca, *reviewed*, 395.
 Catharine of Siena, Saint, by C. M. Anthony, *reviewed*, 394.
 Catholic Emancipation, The Sequel to, by Mgr. Bernard Ward, *reviewed*, 136.
 Catholicism and International Law, by Judge Sir Geo. Sherston Baker, Bart., 103.
 Celtic Countries, The, by Rhys Phillips, *reviewed*, 207.
 Century of Scientific Thought, A, by Sir Bertram Windle, *reviewed*, 400.
 Chabrol, Le Comte de, Notre Patriotisme, *reviewed*, 406.
 Chapman, O.S.B., Dom John, *Clause-Length in English Prose*, 346.
 Children's Encyclopædia, *reviewed*, 207.
 Church of Christ, The, by Rev. P. Finlay, S.J., *reviewed*, 192.
 Civil Liberty in Peace and War, by Rev. J. Keating, S.J., 353.
 Clause-Length in English Prose, by Dom John Chapman, O.S.B., 346.
 Comparative Religion, by L. H. Jordan, *reviewed*, 389.
 Compendium Sacrae Liturgiae, by Fr. Wapelhorst, *reviewed*, 198.
 Conall Cearnach, The Writings on the Walls, *reviewed*, 206.
 Conduct and the Supernatural, by L. S. Thornton, *reviewed*, 189.
 Confirmation, by Fr. O'Dwyer, *reviewed*, 196.
 Conversion d'un Catholique Germanophile, by René Johannet, *reviewed*, 13.

The Index

- Conway, Sir Martin, *The Crowd in Peace and War*, reviewed, 379.
 Cranmer's Liturgical Projects, ed. by Dr. Wickham Legg, reviewed, 206.
 Croce, Benedetto, *What is Living and What is Dead in the Philosophy of Hegel*, reviewed, 413.
 Crowd in Peace and War, *The*, by Sir Martin Conway, reviewed, 379.
 Cuthbert, O.S.F.C., Very Rev. Fr., *The Romanticism of St. Francis*, reviewed, 390.
 Cuthbert, Fr., O.S.F.C., *A Plea for Nationalism*, 36.

- DALTON, O. M., *The Letters of Sidonius*, reviewed, 336.
 D'Arcy, Dr., *God and Freedom in Human Experience*, reviewed, 411.
 Deliverance, by H. O. Taylor, reviewed, 415.
 Denbigh, Lady, *Royalist Father and Roundhead Son*, reviewed, 186.
 Deschamps, Prof. F., *La Philosophie Scolastique et la Guerre*, 230.
 Development of the European Nations, *The*, by J. Holland Rose, reviewed, 204.
 Dieu, *Son Existence et Sa Nature*, by P. Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P., reviewed, 383.
 Dream of Gerontius, *The*, by Cardinal Newman, Illustrated Edition reviewed, 182.
 Driscoll, Rev. J. T., *Pragmatism*, reviewed, 414.

- EASTERN Churches and the War, *The*, by Rev. S. F. Smith, S.J., 157.
 Economic History of England, *The*, by E. Lipson, reviewed, 185.
 Ellerker, Marie, *Master, Where Dweldest Thou?* reviewed, 197.
 England, *The History of*, by John Lingard, D.D., and Hilaire Belloc, reviewed, 183.
 Europe's Ewe Lamb, by Rev. Fr. Vincent McNabb, reviewed, 405.

- FAYLE, C. E., *The Great Settlement*, reviewed, 36.
 Finlay, S.J., Rev. P., *The Church of Christ*, reviewed, 192.
 Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity, by F. Legge, reviewed, 387.
 France, *A History of*, by J. R. Moreton Macdonald, reviewed, 402.
 Francis, *The Romanticism of St.*, by Very Rev. Fr. Cuthbert, O.S.F.C., reviewed, 390.
 Franciscans, *The English*, under Henry III., by John Sever, reviewed, 392.

- GARRIGOU-LAGRANGE, O.P., *Père, Dieu, Son Existence et Sa Nature*, reviewed, 383.
 Gaudreau, Canon, *Le Danger pour l'Eglise est en Allemagne*, reviewed, 13.
 Geographical Aspects of Balkan Problems, by Dr. Marion Newbigin, reviewed, 200.
 German Atrocities from German Evidence, by Joseph Bédier, reviewed, 200.
 German Catholics and the War, 13.
 Germany's Violations of the Laws of War, Ed. by J. O. P. Bland, reviewed, 200.
 Gerrard, Rev. T., *Art after the War*, 51.
 God and Freedom in Human Experience, by Dr. D'Arcy, reviewed, 411.
 Great Settlement, *The*, by C. E. Fayle, reviewed, 36.
 Greek Philosophy, by Professor Burnet, reviewed, 416.
 Gregorian Sacramentary, *The*, Ed. by H. A. Wilson, reviewed, 206.
 Guerre, *La Philosophie Scolastique et la*, by Prof. F. Deschamps, 230.

- HEDLEY, Bishop, by Wilfrid Ward, 1.
 Hegel, *What is Living and What is Dead in the Philosophy of*, by Benedetto Croce reviewed, 413.
 Holland, Bernard, *Aristocracy*, 67.
 Hueffer, F. M., *Between St. Dennis and St. George*, reviewed, 203.
 Hutton, Edward, *Attila and the Huns*, reviewed, 202.

- INFANT Mortality and the Population, by Dr. Alice Vowe Johnson, 324.
 Infant Mortality, by Hugh T. Ashby, reviewed, 324.
 Irishman's Library, *Every*, reviewed, 407.
 Irish Texts Society, *Sixteenth Volume*, reviewed, 395.
 Islam; *A Christian Heresy*, by Mgr. Barnes, 288.
 Is Schism Lawful? *A Study in Primitive Ecclesiology*, by Fr. Maguire, reviewed, 195.

The Index

- JESUIT Father in the Reign of George I., Letters of a*, by R. C. Wilton, 307.
 Johannet, René, *La Conversion d'un Catholique Germanophile*, reviewed, 13.
 Johnson, Dr. Alice Vowe, *Infant Mortality and the Population*, 324.
 Joly, Dr., *The Birth Time of the World*, reviewed, 198.
 Jordan, L. H., *Comparative Religion*, reviewed, 389.
Journal in France and Letters from Italy, by T. W. Allies, reviewed, 188.

KEATING, S. J., Rev. J., *Civil Liberty in Peace and War*, 353.

- L**ANCIANI, Prof., *The Memoria Apostolorum on the Appian Way*, 220.
 Legg, Dr. Wickham, Ed. by, Cranmer's Liturgical Projects, reviewed, 206.
 Legge, F., *Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity*, reviewed, 387.
 Lingard, John, D.D., and Hilaire Belloc, *The History of England*, reviewed, 183.
 Lipson, E., *The Economic History of England*, reviewed, 185.
 Liturgical Publications of Messrs. Burns and Oates, reviewed, 408.
 Ludovici, A. M., *A Defence of Aristocracy*, reviewed, 67.

- M**ACDONALD, J. R. Moreton, *A History of France*, reviewed, 420.
 McNabb, Rev. Fr. Vincent, *Europe's Ewe Lamb*, reviewed, 405.
 McNabb, Fr. Vincent, *The Wayside*, reviewed, 405.
 Maguire, Fr., *Is Schism Lawful? A Study in Primitive Ecclesiology*, reviewed, 195.
 Married Women's Work, Ed. by Clementina Black, reviewed, 324.
 Martindale, S. J., Rev. C. C., *Antologia Laureata*, 259.
 Master, Where Dwellst Thou? by Marie Ellerker, reviewed, 197.
 Mediaeval Anthology, A, by Mary Segar, reviewed, 393.
Memoria Apostolorum on the Appian Way, The, by Prof. Lanciani, 220.
 Memory of Our Dead, The, by Rev. H. Thurston, S. J., reviewed, 404.
 Moxon, R. S., *The Communitorium of Vincentius of Lerins*, Ed. by, reviewed, 384.
 My Slav Friends, by Rothay Reynolds, reviewed, 403.

- N**ATIONALISM, *A Plea for*, by Fr. Cuthbert, O.S.F.C., 36.
 Natural Theology, *Studies in the History of*, by C. Webb, reviewed, 460.
 Newbigin, Dr. Marion, *Geographical Aspects of Balkan Problems*, reviewed, 200.
 Newman, Cardinal, *Illustrated Edition of The Dream of Gerontius*, reviewed, 182.
 Notre Patriotisme, by the Comte de Chabrol, reviewed, 406.

O'DWYER, Fr., *Confirmation*, reviewed, 196.

- P**AGES Religieuses, by M. René Bazin, 406.
 Palmieri, O.S.A., the Rev., *The Religious Ideal of the Slavophiles*, 266.
 Parkyn, E. A., *Prehistoric Art*, reviewed, 401.
 Periodicals, *The Athenaeum*, Subject-Index to, reviewed, 409.
 Personality of Christ, The, by Abbot Vonier, reviewed, 196.
 Phillips, Rhys, *The Celtic Countries*, reviewed, 207.
 Population, by Prof. Warren S. Thompson, reviewed, 324.
 Pragmatism, by Rev. J. T. Driscoll, reviewed, 414.
 Prehistoric Art, by E. A. Parkyn, reviewed, 401.

- R**EYNOLDS, Rothay, *My Slav Friends*, reviewed, 403.
 Rickaby, S. J., Rev. John, *The Gifford Lectures of Mr. Balfour*, 119.
 Rose, J. Holland, *The Development of the European Nations*, reviewed, 274.
 Royalist Father and Roundhead Son, by Lady Denbigh, reviewed, 186.

- S**EGAR, Mary, *A Mediaeval Anthology*, reviewed, 393.
 Sequel to Catholic Emancipation, The, by Mgr. Bernard Ward, reviewed, 136.
 Sever, John, *The English Franciscans under Henry III.*, reviewed, 392.
 Sidonius, *The Letters of*, Translated by O. M. Dalton, M.A., reviewed, 336.

The Index

- Sinclair, May, *A Journal of Impressions in Belgium*, reviewed, 203.
Slavophiles, The Religious Ideal of the, by the Rev. A. Palmieri, O.S.A., 266.
 Smith, S. J., Rev. S. F., *The Eastern Churches and the War*, 157.
 Solitaries of the Sambuca, The, by Montgomery Carmichael, reviewed, 395.
 Soloviev, Vladimir, *War and Christianity*, reviewed, 204.
 Southwark, The Bishop of, *Spain and the War*, 209.
Spain and the War, by the Bishop of Southwark, 209.
 Spens, Will, *Belief and Practice*, reviewed, 191.
 Spirit of Man, The, by Robert Bridges, reviewed, 259.
 Stebbing, C.S.S.R., Rev. George, *The Story of the Catholic Church*, reviewed, 397.
 Story of the Catholic Church, The, by Rev. G. Stebbing, C.S.S.R., reviewed, 397.
 Strong, Mrs. Arthur, *Apotheosis and After-Life*, reviewed, 193.

- T**AYLOR, H. O., *Deliverance*, reviewed, 415.
 Thackeray, Rev. F. St. John, *A Versatile Bishop of the Fifth Century*, 336.
 Thompson, Prof. Warren S., *Population*, reviewed, 324.
 Thornton, L. S., *Conduct and the Supernatural*, reviewed, 189.
 Thurston, S. J., Rev. H., *War and the Prophets*, reviewed, 404.
 The Memory of Our Dead, reviewed, 404.

- V**ERSATILE *Bishop of the Fifth Century, A*, by Rev. F. St. John Thackeray, 336.
 Vincentius of Lerins, *The Commonitorium of*, Ed. by R. S. Moxon, reviewed, 384.
 Vonier, Abbot, *The Personality of Christ*, reviewed, 196.

- W**APELHORST, Fr., *Compendium Sacrae Liturgiae*, reviewed, 198.
 War and Christianity, by Vladimir Soloviev, reviewed, 204.
 War and the Prophets, The, by Rev. H. Thurston, S. J., reviewed, 404.
 Ward, Mgr. Bernard, *The Sequel to Catholic Emancipation*, reviewed, 136.
 Ward, Wilfrid, *Bishop Hedley*, 1.
 Watson, R. W. Seton, *The Balkans, Italy and the Adriatic*, reviewed, 201.
 Wayside, The, by Fr. Vincent McNabb, reviewed, 405.
 Webb, C., *Studies in the History of Natural Theology*, reviewed, 410.
 Westlake, *The Collected Papers of John*, reviewed, 103.
 Whiffen, T., *The North-West Amazons*, reviewed, 398.
 Wilson, H. A., Ed. by, *The Gregorian Sacramentary*, reviewed, 206.
 Wilton, R. C., *Letters of a Jesuit Father in the Reign of George I.*, 307.
 Windle, Sir Bertram, *A Century of Scientific Thought*, reviewed, 400.
 Writings on the Walls, The, by Conall Cearnach, reviewed, 206.

